

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
GALWAY, MARGARET.—Chaucer's Hopeless Love,	431
ROBERTSON, D. W., JR.—The 'Manuel des Péchés' and an English Episcopal Decree,	439
HALL, VERNON, JR.—The Preface to Scaliger's 'Poetices Libri Septem,'	447
WEATHERLY, E. H.—Possible Additions to the Churchill Canon,	453
CRAWFORD, CHARLOTTE E.—Edward Young and the Wycombe Election,	459
VORDTRIEDE, WERNER.—Direct Echoes of French Poetry in Stefan George's Works,	461
BEALL, C. B.—Cristóbal de Mesa and Tasso's 'Rime,'	469
KRAPPE, A. H.—O Sôpro de Deus,	472
CHAMBERS, F. MCM.—Old Provençal 'bederesc,'	475
FRENCH, W. H.—'The Franklin's Tale,' Line 942,	477
CLINE, RUTH HUFF.—Four Chaucer Saints,	480
HORNSTEIN, LILLIAN H.—Some Chaucer Allusions by Sir Edward Coke,	483
PARR, JOHNSTONE.—Chaucer and 'Partonope of Blois,'	486
PARR, JOHNSTONE.—Cresseid's Leprosy Again,	487
SAVAGE, HENRY.—'Lote,' 'Lotes,' in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,'	492
DAVIS, C. R.—A Note on Ælfric's Translation of Job I, 6,	494
PRESCOTT, JOSEPH.—Not in the Dictionaries,	495
GILBERT, A. H.—Milton Quotes from Petrarch?,	496
HAVENS, R. D.—A Misprint in 'The Awkward Age,'	497
PYLES, THOMAS.—A New Meteorological Theory of Stress,	497
REVIEWS:—	
G. M. KAHL, Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist. [<i>L. L. Marts.</i>]	499
JOHN BUTT (ed.), The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. Vol. v. The <i>Dunciad</i> ; edited by JAMES SUTHERLAND; J. E. TOBIN, Alexander Pope: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1895 to 1944. [<i>L. I. Bredvold.</i>]	501
BRIEF MENTION: J. W. SPARGO, Juridical Folklore in England,	502

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RBS.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

ICELANDIC GRAMMAR, TEXTS, GLOSSARY

By STEFÁN EINARSSON

This book on current Icelandic is written to aid the military, the businessman, the traveler, or any foreign resident in Iceland of today. The grammar is full, and gives reliable information on pronunciation, inflexions, and syntax of the language. The texts are partly grammatical exercises for the beginner, partly colloquial dialogues, or descriptions of customs and manners in present day Iceland—town and country. The geography and nature of the country is also discussed and elucidated with maps and drawings. At the end of the book some extracts from a newspaper and a few simple folk tales have been added. The glossary is specially designed to aid the beginner, and it gives the pronunciation of every word. No other glossary or dictionary of Icelandic has this valuable feature, except the great Icelandic-Danish Dictionary by Sigfús Blöndal. The glossary further includes a number of military terms from Icelandic newspapers as well as the most common personal and place names in Iceland.

Since the form of Modern Icelandic has changed so little from Old Icelandic (Old Norse) that the Eddas and the Sagas are still read by anybody in Iceland of today, this book is also of major interest to the student of Old Icelandic.

xxxvii + 501 pp., 19 illustrations. Cloth, \$5.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18

litzer

itors
a the
script
articles
to the
es of
Quo-
, not
MP.,
itors
business

Modern Language Notes

Volume LX

NOVEMBER, 1945

Number 7

CHAUCEUR'S HOPELESS LOVE

In describing in the *Book of the Duchess* (759 ff.) John of Gaunt's early service of Love, before he began loving Blanche of Lancaster, Chaucer used all of a passage in Machaut on a maiden's similar experience except the statement that it lasted "set ans ou huit." He omitted Machaut's phrase of time in this context, Professor Roger Loomis has recently inferred,¹ because he had already used it in the proem, where he claims to have loved some lady hopelessly "this eight yeer" (37). "Any biographic construction based on the duration of the poet's love-sickness must therefore be abandoned," and with it goes "the one solid prop" for the view that his lady was Joan of Kent, who had married the Black Prince eight years before the *Book of the Duchess* was begun. Thus does "a man of gret auctoritee" prescribe Joan's withdrawal to the wings of the Chaucer scene, but so extremely "reluctantly" that an appeal for her recall seems almost to be on order.

It is possible that courtly lovers were expected to serve a kind of apprenticeship, a period of being in love only with Love.² There may even have been some "notion of eight years as a specific time for the service of love" in that sense, though this seems more likely for girls than for boys, since they were considered mature at twelve and fourteen respectively. For Gaunt, who is known to have chosen Blanche by the time he was eighteen, it would have

¹ *MLN*, LIX (1944), 178-80.

² If so, Prof. Loomis's note draws attention to a stage preliminary to the recognized four (see, e.g., M. V. Rosenberg, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*, London, 1937, p. 157). Chaucer shows Gaunt at all five stages: first the prentice, then successively the mute, confessed, slightly encouraged and wholly accepted lover of Blanche.

meant becoming thrall to Love at the age of ten or less. That perhaps is why, in transferring to *his* apprenticeship Machaut's account of a maiden's, Chaucer changed "set ans ou huit" to the vaguer "many a yer" (775). We are at least not bound to postulate an earlier application of the French phrase to himself as the only conceivable motive for his altering it here. In any case Chaucer's own love was the very different matter of love for "oon," which was supposed to last till he or she died. The "eight yer" of the poet's love-sickness ought therefore to be simply his own unaided reckoning of its duration up to date; and his later allusions to it further support this reading as after all the right one. An additional difficulty about the inference that "eight yer" is a displaced loan from Machaut is its dependence on an assumption which there is some reason to question; namely, that lines 35-42 of the *Book of the Duchess* were certainly written before lines 759 ff.

The poem is agreed to have been begun soon after Blanche's death in September 1369. Nine months later, a period which would allow ample time for the completion of a first draft, John of Gaunt went to Aquitaine to take over the king's lieutenancy from the Black Prince.³ With the Duke went his household, now presided over by Lady Katherine Swinford, and already including, it is thought likely, her sister Philippa, Chaucer's wife.⁴ On 20 June 1370, ten days or more before Gaunt sailed, Chaucer himself received a passport and licence to be abroad till 29 September.⁵ Since the coincidence of his journey with his patron's has escaped notice, the poet's destination has remained a mystery. The reasonable conjecture, however, is that he was bound for Aquitaine with Gaunt,⁶ probably in expectation of returning with the Prince and

³ S. Armitage-Smith, *John of Gaunt* (Westminster, 1904), p. 79.

⁴ R. Krauss, *Three Chaucer Studies* (N. Y., 1932), i, 151 and n. 41.

⁵ *Life-Records of Chaucer* (Chaucer Soc.), 63.

⁶ That Chaucer had been with Gaunt in Picardy in the campaign of Aug.-Nov. 1369 there seems no reason to doubt (*L-R*, 61; W. Longman, *Edward III*, II, 162; Armitage-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 72, n. 1). Gaunt returned on Nov. 19. Chaucer's return evidently by Oct. 8 (*L-R*, 59) may not have been unconcerned with the death of the Duke's wife on Sept. 12. In 1370, at the same time as Gaunt sailed for Bordeaux, Knolles set out to invade Normandy (Rymer, *Foedera*, Record ed., III, ii, 890); but Chaucer had no known connection with Knolles, whereas his connection with Gaunt and the Lancaster household was already intimate. The time-limit of his leave also points to his having accompanied Gaunt.

Princess of Wales. In that case he would almost certainly have read his important new poem at the English court in Angoulême, where, it may be remembered, Princess Joan's celebrated predecessor, Eleanor of Aquitaine, had heard and judged the works of her troubadours. With Joan as hostess Chaucer could not gracefully have proceeded to recite his eulogy of another lady without first pausing to acknowledge her. A way of doing this would have been to introduce into the proem an assurance that his love for Joan, rendered hopeless by her marriage to the Prince, had nevertheless continued unabated "this eight yeer." In 1370 it was actually nine years since the marriage, but if Chaucer had not reckoned from the year of beginning the *Book of the Duchess*, 1369, he would have been impolitely revealing that his compliment was an afterthought. Can we be certain that it was not? It follows his answer to the question of why he is sleepless:

Myselven cannot telle why
The sothe; but trewely, as I gesse,
I holde hit be a sicknesse
That I have suffred this eight yeer. . . . (34-7)

Line 34 seems to complete his answer. Line 35 adds a redundant phrase, awkwardly tacked on, and contributes nothing of value except a rhyme for the coming key-word "sicknesse." "The sothe," accordingly, looks not unlike a bit of putty marking the beginning of a later insertion.

Several of Chaucer's long poems which are not about his beloved lady contain similar asides on her, and she was evidently the subject of all his extant serious love-poems.⁷ That these tributes are in the tradition of *amour courtois* has slowly come to be recognized, but the full implications for the poet's life and work have yet to be considered. The troubadours and trouvères who set the long-enduring fashion regularly attached themselves to the service of

⁷ As distinct from the flippant *Rosemounde*, *Women Unconstant* and *Merciles Beaute*, which I have found reason to think were for little Isabel of France (cf. J. M. Manly, *Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer*, London, 1940, p. 40). The revised *Legend Prologue* (G or A) appears to be connected with Richard II's marriage (Nov. 1396) to this French princess; witness the introduction of "newe" fleurs-de-lys into the garland of the god of Love, here probably representing Richard. See G 161 and n. 16 below.

some married great lady, countess, princess or queen. It was an arrangement of mutual benefit. Writing himself the lady's faithful servant, love-sick but never sick of love, the poet poured forth praises of her beauty and virtue. Provided his songs were good enough to please castle audiences far and wide, they greatly pleased the lady whom they celebrated; and, says Jeanroy, "en échange de ce service, elle lui doit, comme le bon seigneur au vassal, aide, protection et secours."⁸ Good love-songs, too, were considered a poet's best claim to fame,⁹ and the greater the renown of his lady the better for his own. Chaucer in the flower of his youth, Gower tells us, filled the land with love-songs.¹⁰ While he had been a page in the household of Prince Lionel and the Lady Elizabeth he must have seen at court functions their foster sister, Joan, Countess of Kent, the observed of all observers on account of her amazing beauty, her charm, her leadership of fashion and the romance of her past. He was nearing twenty when Joan became Princess of Wales and thereby prospective Queen of England, the ideal sovereign lady for an aspiring English poet. And this well-marked year in which the Prince of Wales acquired Joan for his bride, and in which there was no other outstanding English marriage, is the year from which Chaucer publicly dates his complimentary pose of rejected suitor. Some hearers or readers of the *Book of the Duchess* could hardly have failed to infer that Princess Joan was the lady for whom the author, in the approved manner of complimenting *grandes dames*, professed to have been pining "this eight year."

On the debated issue of who Chaucer's "lady sovereignty" of the *Legend Prologue* was, new documentary evidence is available. She is there represented as Alceste, and, oddly, as laying down the law

⁸ Prof. A. Jeanroy's standard work, the chief source of my remarks on the tradition: *La Poésie Lyrique Des Troubadours* (Paris, 1934), I, 91. One troubadour explained to his lady: "Si j'ai chanté votre valeur, votre sagesse, ce n'était point que je vous aimasse: je le faisais pour acquérir honneur et profit" (*ibid.*, p. 97 f.).

⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 62 f. To be judged good, a love-poem needed metrical distinction. The three famous metres which Chaucer introduced into English were used as offerings to his lady: rhyme royal (most of the love-poems), heroic couplet (*LGW*) and *terza rima* (*To His Lady*). *WN* has a nine-line stanza of two rhymes.

¹⁰ *Complete Works*, ed. Macaulay (Oxford, 1901), III, *CA*, viii, 2943-7.*

on a king's duties in the course of making peace between the god of Love and the poet (F 342 ff.). The poem has recently been ascribed to late 1384 or soon after.¹¹ Early in 1385 Princess Joan, by now long a widow and for the past few years retired, made peace during a return visit to court between Richard II and John of Gaunt.¹² The quarrel had arisen through Richard's crediting a charge of treason against his uncle, and then heeding counsels of revenge from young friends who found it profitable to encourage his vanity and his desire to rule single-handed. By the time his mother intervened, another of the king's uncles, Thomas of Woodstock, was involved, besides the earls of Oxford, Salisbury and Nottingham, and civil war was imminent. Joan began with a thundering lecture to her royal son on his folly in countenancing flatterers,¹³ and his need to keep on good terms with his nobles, especially with his father's eldest brother, to whom special respect was due, and with his other uncles.¹⁴ Enough of her historic speech on that occasion is preserved in contemporary chronicles, and has now been found,¹⁵ to show that it is Alceste's speech on a king's duties: to discountenance flatterers; to deal justly with his lieges; to give due respect to the nobles nearest to him in status and kinship, and so on, every word speaking to the point to which Joan had spoken. Realizing that although Alceste addressed her lecture to the god of Love she was aiming it at Richard, Professor Legouis guessed that she was the mother of the young king;¹⁶ the

¹¹ Carleton Brown, *MLN*, LVIII (1943), 274-8.

¹² Malverne's suppl. to *Polychronicon* (Rolls Series), IX, 55-8; *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), II, 112-26. The interview with Richard which led Gaunt to prepare for a siege in one of his castles took place at Sheen on 23 Feb. 1385. Joan quickly appeared, lectured Richard, and brought Gaunt back for the reconciliation at Eltham on 6 March.

¹³ M. Galway, *TLS*, 10 Oct. 1942, p. 499, quoting *Chronicon Adae De Usk*.

¹⁴ Malverne, *loc. cit.*, p. 57 f.

¹⁵ The parallel in Malverne is here noted for the first time.

¹⁶ *Geoffrey Chaucer*, trans. L. Lailavoix (London, 1913), p. 41. In Prol. F. the god of Love, Alceste's consort, is evidently the late Black Prince. See 552-3, 1-6; 230-1; 212, 563-4. In revision (cf. n. 7 above) Chaucer removed all these signs that the god was a shade and Alceste his widow, together with the god's allusion to her, *qua* daisy, as "my relyke" (321). Apparently this is an allegorical way of saying "my relict," despite *NED*'s not recording *relict* in the sense of widow until 1545. O. F. *relicte* in that sense is recorded in 1363 (Godefroy). The removal of "my relyke" does

earliest audiences of the *Legend Prologue* would have known that she was. As "Alceste," then, Chaucer's sovereign lady is unmistakably Joan; as his unnamed "oon" of the *Book of the Duchess* she is more probably Joan than anyone else. The later certainty thus reinforces the earlier probability.

In various ways Chaucer's amorous allusions and effusions up to the time of the *Legend Prologue* reveal continuity and interconnections. They also range in reference over exactly the quarter century between Joan's last marriage and her death. Some seven years after the *Book of the Duchess* the poet complains again of his love-sickness in the *Parlement of Foules* (89-91). Some four years later still, he may have had it in mind in the *House of Fame* (614-25). At the end of *Troilus and Criseyde*, completed at about the same time as the *Legend Prologue*, he does further homage to "Alceste" (bk. v, 1777-8; cf. 1527-33). The passage in the *Parlement* is practically identical with passages in two of his love-poems, the complaints *To Pity* (99-104) and *To His Lady* (42-4). In the first he addresses the lady as "rial excellence" and "regalye" (59, 65), in the second as "hynesse" (70), titles appropriate to the Princess of Wales. Both complaints are dated about the time of Chaucer's visit to Italy in 1373, and in them he speaks of having loved the lady "yore" (*Pity*, 93) and "ful yore" (*Lady*, 79), terms which would refer back to his lady of the *Book of the Duchess*. Other love-poems which either certainly or all but certainly concern the same royalty are the *Balade of Complaint*, *Womanly Noblesse* and the balade in praise of "my lady" in the *Legend Prologue* (F 249-61). In all these he vows to remain the lady's faithful servant for life. In the love-poem part of the *Legend Prologue* he

not support the proposed reading, "my treasure." Prof. Loomis justly notes the impropriety of representing Alceste, the faithful wife of King Admetus, as the widow of the god of Love. It is lessened by the description of the god as "eke a kyng" (431), and by the use of "Alceste" and "god of Love" as pseudonyms for real persons, in the manner of the troubadours' complimentary *senhals* (Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, I, 317 ff.). "Alceste" implies sacrificial devotion to a dying husband; "god of Love" was applied in the previous century to a knight who, like the Prince in his day, was expert in *amour courtois* (F. Hueffer, *The Troubadours*, London, 1878, p. 274). Yet some impropriety remains, suggesting that Chaucer was more concerned to compliment *his* Alceste than to avoid *lèse-majesté* to the mythical queen.

repeats the vow to the Princess. Here however he notably contrives at once to hint that his love has become platonic and yet not to obviate a contrary inference. I love her, he says,

And evere shal, til that myn herte dye.
 Al swere I nat, of this I wol nat lye;
Ther loved no wight hotter in his lyve. (57-9)

According to troubadour custom, a poet professed a desire to win a great lady only when she was unavailable. Chaucer's care not to express that desire in regard to the widowed Princess is natural, but his care not to deny it suggests that he may previously have harped on it, as he had done in early compliments to his lady. A year after the death of the Black Prince, in the *Parlement of Foules* of 1377,¹⁷ although he speaks in his own person of his hopeless love, he makes Africanus say to him:

Thow of love hast lost thy tast, I guess. (160)

There is nothing explicitly passionate in any reference to his lady known to be later than this, nor in *Womanly Noblesse* (? 1380). Apparently the toned-down protestations coincide in time with Joan's widowhood, and after her death on 7 August 1385 Chaucer addressed no more of them to a mature and living *grande dame*.¹⁸ Instead, he burst into gay anti-feminism.¹⁹ Beginning therefore with an antecedent likelihood that he adopted the Princess of Wales for his sovereign lady as from 1361, we proceed, via tributes of steady continuity and appropriateness to her, to the certainty that by 1385 she was his established sovereign lady. The burden of proof consequently passes to whoever would maintain that she was not the "oon" to whom he alluded in the *Book of the Duchess*.

The question of Joan's patronage of Chaucer can for the present be no more than touched on. Hints of it appear soon after her return from Aquitaine, and clear signs onwards from her husband's death in June 1376: Chaucer's appointments, for example, as a

¹⁷ H. Braddy, *Three Chaucer Studies*, ii; a contribution which wears well.

¹⁸ Cf. n. 7 above, and Chaucer's leaving unfinished the *LGW*, a long poem for Joan. There are allusions to "Alceste" in the *Fk. Ta.* (1442) and in the *IMLT* (75), the first probably memorial (Robinson, p. 826), the second evidently not (Carleton Brown, *SP*, xxxiv, 8-35).

¹⁹ Another custom of the troubadours when off duty as censors (Jeanroy, *op. cit.*, II, 192 ff.; cf. 26, 45).

confidential marriage commissioner for her son;²⁰ his bumper crop of royal honours in the early years of Richard's reign, when the mother of the boy king was the real ruler of the land; his close friendship with several of her most intimate servants, including Clifford, Stury and Vache, and the misfortunes he shared with them when she was no longer alive to give him "aide, protection et secours," but Thomas of Woodstock was free to vent his spleen on those whom she had conspicuously favoured.²¹ In the *Troilus* frontispiece, which represents the author reciting to a court audience at some time in 1382-85, the lady in the foreground registering marked appreciation is surely without question Princess Joan, recognizable by her coronet, by the wide-sleeved, ermine-trimmed gown she had made fashionable,²² and by her significant position, providing a stem for Richard.²³ Chaucer's last known reward in direct connection with the Princess was of mourning for her funeral.²⁴

²⁰ See Braddy's thesis (cited n. 17 above), except the aside (p. 39-41) on Chaucer's owing his appointments to Alice Perrers. The detailed arrangements for Richard's marriage were strictly his mother's business, by natural, traditional and circumstantial right. Besides, after Edward III's death (June 1377) had reduced Alice to complete political nonentity, Chaucer continued to be appointed as before (*L-R*, 143). A document not hitherto considered in this connection is worth noting. Soon after the meeting of a conference in Jan. 1378 to discuss a French match for Richard (*Foedera*, iv, 28), which conference was almost certainly the one in Richard's reign attended by Chaucer, Princess Joan decided to explore the possibilities of a Navarrese match. The document in question shows her completely dominating the marriage council and managing the whole affair, including the appointment of the confidential commissioner (*Chronique des règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*, ed. R. Delachenal, Soc. de l'Hist. de France, 1920, II, 301 ff.; 286, n. 1).

²¹ All the reasons for ascribing these misfortunes to Gloucester cannot be given here, but some are indicated in Miss Rickert's paper on Vache (*MP*, xi, 209-25) and in mine on Chaucer as J. P. and M. P. (*MLR*, xxxvi, 29-31).

²² *Le Livre du Chevalier de La Tour Landry*, ed. A. De Montaiglon (Paris, 1854), p. 47.

²³ Cf. the three men standing on much the same level, who appear to be the king's three uncles. John is on the extreme right. The man between him and the one on the extreme left, Brusendorff thinks, is probably Thomas. Brusendorff however does not mention Edmund or his portrait, an examination of which might lead to a different conclusion (*The Chaucer Tradition*, Copenhagen, 1925, p. 22, n. 6).

²⁴ E. Rickert, *TLS*, 11 Aug. 1927, p. 548.

My own view of the challenged paper of 1936, in which Joan was first proposed as Chaucer's sovereign lady, is that it blundered darkly to the right conclusion. The perception behind Professor Loomis's reluctance to abandon that conclusion entirely, considering the argument for it, seems to be nothing short of clairvoyant, whereas his recent fear that it ought to be abandoned seems groundless. Evidence in support of the original proposal is still accumulating, and already too extensive to be fully presented in a few pages. But it is hoped that these samples, offered at once, may at least ward off a final decision to regard the eight years of Chaucer's hopeless love as a borrowed reckoning, rather than as a personal one, constituting the first of a series of courtly bows to the Princess of Wales in poems concerning others.

MARGARET GALWAY

University of Birmingham, England

THE MANUEL DES PÉCHÉS AND AN ENGLISH EPISCOPAL DECREE

In his recent study of the *Manuel des Péchés*, Dr. E. J. Arnould called attention to a decree appearing in the Constitutions of Bishop Grosseteste, describing it as "un chapitre qui pourrait presque servir de table ou d'introduction à notre *Manuel*."¹ Perhaps the decree in question was, in a sense, actually just such a "table." It runs:

Quia igitur sine decalogi observatione salus animarum non consistit, exhortamur in Domino, firmiter injungentes, ut unusquisque pastor animarum et quilibet sacerdos parochialis sciat decalogum, id est, decem mandata legis Moysaicae; eademque populo sibi subjecto frequenter praedicet et exponat. Sciat quoque quae sint septem criminalia, eademque similiter populo praedicet fugienda; sciat insuper saltem simpliciter, septem ecclesiastica sacramenta; et hi qui sunt sacerdotes maxime sciant, quae exiguntur ad verae confessionis et poenitentiae sacramentum, formamque baptizandi; doceant frequenter laicos in idiomate communi: habeat quoque quisque eorum saltem simplicem fidei intellectum, sicut

¹ *Le Manuel des Péchés*, Paris, 1940, p. 20. This work was reviewed by Charlton Laird, *Speculum*, xx (1945), pp. 99-103.

continetur in symbolo, tam majore quam minore, et in tractatu qui dicitur *Quicumque vult*, qui cotidie ad primam in ecclesia psallitur.²

The materials here demanded correspond closely with the contents of the earlier versions of the *Manuel*, and the arrangement of topics is strikingly similar.³ The decree, however, has a history outside of Grosseteste's Constitutions of such a character as to make an actual relationship between it and the *Manuel* seem probable.

Grosseteste's statute was not of his own making, but was taken over, as C. R. Cheney has put it, "with only slight retouching," from the Constitutions of Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester (1240).⁴ The changes made by Grosseteste serve principally to soften the emphasis on confession which appears in the original:

Sciuntque sacerdotes ea, quae exiguntur ad verae confessionis poenitentiae sacramentum. Et quia observatio decalogi necessaria est fidelibus ad salutem; exhortamur in Domino sacerdotes, et pastores animarum, ut sciant decalogum, id est, decem mandata legis Mosaicae, quae populo suo sibi subjecto, frequenter praedicent, et exponant. Sciunt quoque, quae sunt septem criminalia peccata, quae populo praedicent fugienda. Sciunt autem saltem simpliciter vii ecclesiastica sacramenta, quae sunt. Habeat etiam saltem quilibet eorum fidei simplicem intellectum secundum quod continetur in psalmo, qui dicitur "*Quicumque vult*," et tam in majori, quam in minori symbolo; ut in his plebem commissam noverint informare.⁵

The demand for priestly knowledge concerning confession here appears at the beginning, as though it were a topic sentence. That an emphasis of this kind was intended is clear from what follows immediately:

Ut autem sciant sacerdotes, quorum aliqui sunt simplices, pro quibus delictis superioribus sunt poenitentiae reservandae; ut sciant etiam parochianos suos instruere, quomodo debeant confiteri, necnon et eorum conscientias perscrutari, injunctionum etiam diversitates, quia non sanat

² *Epistolae*, ed. H. R. Luard, Rolls Series, 1861, p. 155.

³ It now seems probable that the *Manuel* originally contained the following sections: (1) the Articles of the Faith, (2) the Ten Commandments, (3) the Seven Sins, (4) Sacrilege, (5) the Sacraments, (6) the Points of Shrift. See Laird, *op. cit.*, p. 100; Arnould, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-106. Professor Laird tells me, however, that in a forthcoming article he will suggest that the original *Manuel* may not have contained the Articles of the Faith. The baptismal ceremony is discussed under the sacraments.

⁴ *English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century*, Oxford, 1941, p. 121.

⁵ Wilkins, *Concilia*, I, p. 669.

oculum quod sanat calcaneum, quendam tractatum de confessione fecimus, quem sciri ab omnibus capellanis praecipimus, et etiam observari in confessionibus audiendis, quia longum esset, ipsum in praesenti synodo publicare.*

It is unfortunate that Bishop Walter decided not to publish his treatise with his decrees, for it does not survive.⁷ Several features of his description of it, however, are pertinent to the present discussion. In the first place, the instructional materials listed do not constitute specifically a list of minimum requirements for catechistical instruction;⁸ rather, they are presented as suitable materials for a treatise *De confessione*. Moreover, they are referred to as "*delictis*," a clear indication that the author was interested primarily in sins connected with the various rubrics; that is, he was not concerned, for example, with the abstract theology of the commandments and the sacraments but with transgressions against them. Finally, Bishop Walter wished not only to instruct his priests in the technique of confession, but also to have the priests teach their parishioners how they should confess, and how they should examine their consciences.

* *Loc. cit.*

⁷ Cf. Cheney, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-43.

⁸ The absence of the Lord's Prayer is a striking illustration of this fact. It was demanded as a primary element of religious knowledge throughout the Middle Ages. E. g. see St. Augustine, *Sermones, Opera*, Paris, 1679-1700, v, cols. 331, 343, 942; St. Caesarius of Arles, *Opera*, Maretoli, 1937-, I, pp. 75-76, 890; Rabanus Maurus, *Homeliae* (First Series), Migne, *PL*, CX, c. 27; Benjamin Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes*, London, 1840, pp. 397, 445; F. Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, Halle, 1898-1916, I, pp. 302-304 (I Cnut, 22, 1-6); B. Thorpe, *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, London, 1844, 1846, II, p. 604; A. Napier, *Wulfstan*, Berlin, 1883, pp. 20-21, 33; Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, Lib. II, Caps. LXII, OLVI, Migne, *PL*, CXL, cols. 637, 651; Adrian Morey, *Bartholomew of Exeter*, Cambridge, 1937, pp. 175, 176; and, in general, F. M. Powicke, *Christian Life in the Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1935, p. 32. The *Ave Maria* was also considered fundamental in the thirteenth century. See H. Leclercq, "Sur la Salutation Angélique," in Hefele et al., *Histoire des Conciles*, Paris, 1907-1938, v, Appendice IV, p. 1747. In 1237, three years before Walter de Cantilupe's statutes were issued, Bishop Alexander of Coventry demanded that every Christian repeat the Lord's Prayer and the *Ave* seven times a day. See Wilkins, I, p. 642. A typical catalogue of the elements of catechistical instruction appears in the famous decree of Archbishop Peckham (1281), Wilkins, II, p. 54. This list is more comprehensive and considerably more general than that of Walter de Cantilupe.

Turning now to the *Manuel des Péchés*, we find a book, which, as the title indicates, is concerned with "*delictis*," and which was written to teach laymen "*quomodo debeant confiteri, necnon et eorum conscientias perscrutari*":

La uertue del seint esprit
 Nus seit eidant en cest escrit,
 A nus les choses ben mustrer
 Dunt hom se deit confesser,
 E aussi en quele manere,
 Qe ne fet mie bon a tere;
 Car ceo la uertue del sacrement,
 Dire le pechié, et coment.
 Tuz pechiéz ne poun recunter;
 Mes par tant se peot remembrer,
 E les pechiéz amender,
 Qe cest escrit uelt regarder.

Pur la laie gent ert fet,
 Deu le parface, si li plest,
 Qe il vere pussent apertement
 Qant il trespasent, & qant nient.*

In other words, not only is the general outline of the *Manuel* very similar to that of Walter de Cantilupe's decree, but the purpose of the *Manuel* is similar to the purpose of the treatise which Bishop Walter had in mind when he wrote the decree. Both treatises may be described as compendia of sins designed to promote the efficacy of confession. On the basis of the available evidence, one may say that the *Manuel* has the appearance of an elaboration for lay consumption of some treatise such as that described by Walter de Cantilupe.

Bishop Grosseteste was not the only churchman to appropriate Walter de Cantilupe's decree. A variant appears in the Constitutions of Bishop Walter de Kirkham of Durham (1255) which differs only slightly from that of Bishop Grosseteste. The Lord's Prayer, the *Ave*, and the Sign of the Cross are added to the list of materials demanded, so that the whole has the appearance of a list of catechistical materials rather than that of an outline for confessional instruction.¹⁰ A fourth variant, which is exactly like Grosse-

* Ed. F. J. Furnivall, *EETS OS* 119, ll. 1-12; 113-116. Cf. Arnould, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

¹⁰ Wilkins, I, p. 704. Cf. note 8, above.

teste's except for an unimportant introductory sentence, appears in the Statutes of Bishops Walter and Simon of Norwich.¹¹ But the most elaborate variant of all forms one of the decrees of Bishop Peter Quivil's Synod of Exeter (1287). It is probably too late to have had any influence on the *Manuel*,¹² but an examination of it may shed some light on the tradition of the decree:

Omnium mater errorum ignorantia praecipue sacerdotibus est vitanda, qui in populo docendi officium susceperunt, quorum opus in praedicatione et doctrina consistit, ut aedificent cunctos tam fidei scientia, quam operum disciplina. Ne igitur per caecitatis ignorantiam, dum ducatum praestant populo christiano, ambo in foveam delabantur; singulis locorum archidiaconis injungimus, ut diligenter inquirant, qui rectores, vicarii, aut sacerdotes in literatura enormem patiuntur defectum; et postquam eis de hoc constiterit, nobis denunciare quam citius non omittant.

De parochialibus sacerdotibus frequentem assumant experientiam et habeant, an sciant decalogum, id est, praecepta legis Moysaicae, ipsa que subditae plebi exponant, et solcite praedicent observanda. An etiam sciant septem peccata mortalia, ipsaque praedicent populo fugienda. Sciant etiam septem sacramenta ecclesiastica, et qualiter habent conferri, ut supra diximus,¹³ unumquodque. Et in articulorum fidei christianorum saltem simplicem habeant intellectum, prout in psalmo, "Quicumque vult," et in utroque symbolo continentur; in quibus plebem sibi commissam tanto tenentur studiosius informare, quanto quilibet, qui fidem catholicam firmiter non crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

Sacerdotes autem si quos invenerint circa praemissa nimia ignorantia laborare, ipsos protinus suspendant ab officio sacerdotali; maxime a regimine animarum, ad quos quidem divinus sermo dicitur: "Tu vero scientiam repulisti, et ego te repellam, ne fungaris mihi sacerdotio."

Ut autem quilibet sacerdos, cui animarum cura incumbit, melius sciat et intelligat, qualiter debeat in ipsa versari; praecipimus, quod quilibet, cui parochialis ecclesiae regimen incumbit, quandam summulam plurimum utilem, immo verius necessarium a diversis tractatibus extractam sub compendio (quae summula sub eisdem verbis incipit, quibus et praesens synodus) citra festum S^{ci} Michaelis habeat scriptam, et ipsam sane intelligat, ac ea utatur sub poena unius marcae, loci archidiacono applicandae. Quam si archidiaconus remiserit, et ipsam, vel ipsius partem quandam levare poterit, et recipere praetermiserit, eundem archidiaconum in duabus marcis fabricae ecclesiae Exonensi volumus obligari.¹⁴

¹¹ *Ibid.*, I, pp. 731-732.

¹² Arnould, *op. cit.*, p. 256, dates the *Manuel* ca. 1260.

¹³ The first chapter of the synod, Wilkins, II, p. 130, states that the priests are to have an adequate knowledge of the sacraments, and in the following sections, pp. 131-137, there is an elaborate explanation of what they are to know about each one.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, II, pp. 143-144.

This variant differs from the earlier ones quoted chiefly in that Bishop Quivil was more deeply concerned about clerical ignorance than were his predecessors. It is not clear from the decree whether he had in mind catechistical materials or materials concerned with confession; but unlike Walter de Cantilupe, he published the treatise he wrote to carry out his educational program with his decrees, so that we can readily discover what he meant by examining the treatise.

The prologue to the *Summula*, as Bishop Quivil called his treatise, in good sermon style, develops the theme *Altissimus de terra creavit medicinam* (Ecclus. 38) to form, with a concordance of authorities, the conclusion that the Trinity is a physician, sin is a malady to be healed, and penance is the proper medicine. It then continues:

Haec ergo ego Petrus, Exoniensis presbyter, intime considerans, et insufficientia presbytorum secularium confessiones audientium compatiens, quorum ignorantium, proh dolor! saepissime sim expertus; praesentem summulam eisdem assigno, ut eam sciant ad utilitatem suam et confitentium.¹⁵

We see that the treatise was not written to enable priests to enumerate the commandments, sins, and so on by rote;¹⁶ it was a treatise *de confessione* to assist the priests in analyzing the experience of their penitents. Both Walter de Cantilupe and Peter Quivil, then, wrote confessional treatises based on an outline of materials which corresponds closely with the general contents of the *Manuel*, which in turn is a confessional treatise addressed to laymen.

Although the *Summula* is later than the *Manuel*, it probably represents fairly well the type of material traditionally associated with the decree, so that by comparing the two works it is possible to form some judgment as to whether or not an hypothetical association of the *Manuel* with the decree is justifiable. Except for the omission of the sacraments, which Bishop Quivil had already discussed at length, the *Summula* elaborates the topics of the decree in the sequence in which they appear there. For the purposes of the comparison, we may disregard the *exempla* in the *Manuel*, which represent a part of its author's efforts to adapt his

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, p. 162.

¹⁶ This is the view of Miss Margaret Deanesley, *The Lollard Bible*, Cambridge, 1920, pp. 196-197.

material for lay consumption. I append below summaries of two sections of the *Manuel* together with corresponding sections of the *Summula*.

1. The First Commandment

M.

Even if you have committed the worst of sins, renouncing God, you may be forgiven if you ask mercy, as an *exemplum* shows. If you have practiced necromancy or conjured the Devil, you have violated this commandment. If you have used the psalter for divination or looked in a sword or basin, that was great folly. If you have believed in bird omens, or omens of morning meetings, you have been foolish. (There follows an exposition of St. Gregory's six causes of dreams. Cf. *Moralia*, VIII, Cap. XXIV, 42, Migne, *PL*, LXXV, c. 827; or, better, *Dialogi*, ed. U. Moricca, Rome, 1924, pp. 309-310, for an *exemplum* from the *Dialogi* follows.) One should not believe in sorcery, speak against the faith, nor believe in the three fates. No mortal sin is forgiven without confession.¹⁷

S.

Recurrat igitur poenitens ad primum mandatum et solícite videat in seipso, si transgressus fuerit illud. An scil. cultum soli Deo debitum, daemóniis, vel aliis creaturis exhibuerit; scil. faciendo praestigia, id est, recurrendo ad conjurationes, sicut solet fieri pro furto, in gladio, in pelvi, et in nominibus scriptis et inclusis in luto, et impositis in aqua benedicta, et similia; vel recurrendo ad auguria sortiarii, vel si sortiariis pro talibus consulerit, et daemónibus sacrificaverit, sicut faciant quidam miseri pro mulieribus, quas amant fatue.¹⁸

2. The Fifth Commandment

M.

One should not slay another for felony without justice, nor put anyone in a prison or other place so that he dies. If you deprive anyone of a limb, you are guilty. If you fail to give to the poor and hungry, you are guilty of spiritual slaughter. False counsel resulting in death is evil. Judgment without mercy is criminal, as an *exemplum* shows. Distracting others from good purposes is spiritual slaughter, and detraction also slays. Evil speaking, as an *exemplum* demonstrates, is to be avoided.¹⁹

S.

Deinde videndum est, quod si transgressus fuerit quintum mandatum, quod est, "non occides"; sive manu occidendo vel vulnerando, vel praecipiendo; vel voluntarie, scil. occidendo, vel. odiendo usque ad mortem;

¹⁷ *Manuel*, II, 923-1314.

¹⁸ Wilkins, II, 162.

¹⁹ *Manuel*, II, 1887-2146.

quia qui odit fratrem suum, homicida est: vel subsidium necessarium subtrahendo, quia si non paveris, occidisti; vel spiritualiter, vel pravum actionis, sive locutionis exemplum.²⁰

I have purposely selected sections in which resemblances exist; that is, correspondences like those indicated above do not appear in all sections of the two books. However, there are other resemblances. For example, a glance at the section of the *Manuel* on pride will reveal that it consists largely of a list of objects, situations, attributes, and so on about which one is apt to be proud. The second half of Peter Quivil's discussion of the subject runs as follows:

Habet autem superbia materiam multiplicem; scil. bona naturalia; quando scil. homo superbit ex bonis naturalibus, quae habet; ut ex fortitudine, si est fortis homo; ex ingenio, si est boni ingenii; ex specie, si est pulcher; ex facundia, si sit homo eloquens, ut quidam legistae, et etiam laici, qui loquuntur coram iudicibus laicis; vel etiam si habeat bonam vocem. Item ex nobilitate, si est ex magno genere; ex prole, ut si multos, vel plures, vel bonos filios vel filias habet. Habet etiam superbia pro materia bona temporalia; ut quando homo superbit, quia multas habet vel pretiosas vestes, domos, vel agros, vel redditus, vel multos homines, vel servientes, vel bonos equos, vel quando praepositus est aliis in temporalibus. Habet etiam superbia de materia bona gratuita, quae sunt ex gratia; ut quando superbit, quia sciens est, vel etiam bonus clericus vel bonus praedicator vel bonus placitator, vel bonus artifex, vel bonus colonus. Vel quando homo superbit propter virtutem; quia credit se bonum esse, et abominabitur peccatores: vel quando superbit, quia habet gratiam hominum; vel quia habet bonam famam, vel dignitatem ecclesiasticum, vel ordinem; et secundum omnes istas diversitates, diversae poenitentiae sunt injungendae.²¹

Many of the details in this passage also appear in the *Manuel*. It is thus possible to say that the same general type of material appears in both works, although the resemblance does not consistently extend to specific details. The *Manuel* is, of course, much longer and far more elaborate than the *Summula*.

To conclude, the *Manuel* resembles two works we know to have been based on the decree in general outline and purpose, and it resembles at least one of these in content. In view of the popularity of the decree, and the estimation in which it was held by

²⁰ Wilkins, II, 163.

²¹ Wilkins, II, 164.

English bishops, it seems unlikely that these resemblances were fortuitous. Just exactly where in the history of the decree the *Manuel* arose, it is impossible to decide on the basis of the facts now at hand;²² however, the assumption that the *Manuel* and the decree were related seems a reasonable working hypothesis on which to base further research.²³ It is probable that the decree accounts in part for the popularity of the *Manuel*, whether there is a direct relationship between the two or not.

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.

University of North Carolina

THE PREFACE TO SCALIGER'S *POETICES* *LIBRI SEPTEM*

Julius Caesar Scaliger's famous *Poetics*¹ published in 1560, two years after the author's death, is preceded by a prefatory letter addressed to his eldest son Sylvius.² Of interest in itself as an

²² The decree may have appeared elsewhere in church councils, not all of which are at present available. See Cheney, *op. cit.*, p. vi. There is also possibility that it may have appeared in other contexts outside of the councils.

²³ I hope to make the resemblance between the *Manuel* and the *Summula* clearer in a study of the literary tradition from which both arose.

¹ Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* went through at least five editions, but the differences between them are so slight that they would be called reprints today. The copy from which I quote in this paper is the third edition, 1586.

² Stephanus Sylvius Caesar Scaliger, Lord of Verona, Vives and Gohas, the eldest son of Julius and Andiette de La Roque Scaliger, was born in Agen in 1530. He studied first at the College of Guyenne and later at the College of Navarre in Paris in 1562. He married Marguerite de Nozières de Bezat, the daughter of a nobleman. She died in the same year and he married Catherine de Biran, Lady of Gohas, in 1575. Although he was left a large fortune by his father, he managed to spend not only his own but most of that of his brothers before his death in 1585. (Jules de Bourrousse de Laffore, "Jules-César de Lescaze," *Société d'Agriculture, sciences et arts d'Agen*, 2nd series, I, 50-53.) His one appearance on the stage of history was in 1562 when he was sent to Symphorien de Durfort by the people of Agen to ask what to do about the threat that Monluc's advance faced them with. (De Bèze, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, Paris, 1884, II, 912.) He was a very learned man, but did not practice any of the arts or sciences. Joseph's estimate of him is colored by his annoyance at his

example of the elder Scaliger's style, this letter deserves being examined because of the unfortunate fact that its contents have been misunderstood. Both George Saintsbury in his *History of Criticism* and Charles Sears Baldwin in his *Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* were under the impression that the letter was entirely about the *Poetics*. Actually, as I shall show, a good part of it is an answer to certain criticisms made of a previous book of Scaliger's, his *De Causis linguae latinae*.

First, though, let us look at the passages in question in Saintsbury and Baldwin. Saintsbury writes:

Nothing (certain inevitable postulates being granted) can be more luminous and intelligible than the book. . . . That he stands forth in the preface to his son Sylvius with an air of patronage at once paternal and pedagogic, announcing himself as the pioneer of the subject, dismissing those who allege Varro, as with levity ignoring the fact that neither Varro or anybody else in antiquity did, or could do, anything of the kind: that he blandly sweeps away the *plebs grammaticorum*; that he labels the *Ars Poetica* itself as teaching *adeo sine ulla arte ut saturae proprius esse videatur*, Aristotle as fragmentary, Vida as *optimus poeta in theatro*, *claudus magister in schola*—is all of it agreeably Scaligerian in manner.³

In much the same manner, Baldwin writes of Scaliger's *Poetics*:

Its complacency must have been sometimes startling even to the Renaissance. The prefatory letter to his son Sylvius is magisterial.

"To this art we have applied the sanctions of philosophy which are the executives of all nature. That for lack of them it has hardly been an art before us is evident from our discussion."

Baldwin then continues his translation from the preface through the remarks on Aristotle and Vida cited by Saintsbury.⁴

having spent the family fortune. He says of him, "Sylvius fuit doctus, habitat prope Bartas; erat negligens; nihil scripsit: liberos non reliquit, bona ejus habuit Nepos uxoris ipsius, per stultitiam et negligentiam fratris." (*Scaligeriana*, editio altera, Rouen, 1667, p. 233.)

³ *A History of Criticism* (New York, Edinburgh, and London, 1902), II, 70.

⁴ *Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (ed. with an introduction by Donald L. Clark, New York, 1939), pp. 171-172. Since in the introduction Professor Clark writes, "[Baldwin's] method to go directly to the original sources, both for theory and practice, to make his own translation, and to ignore secondary sources, which he rarely cites," we may consider that Baldwin's misinterpretation was made independently of Saintsbury's. I

A reader of these two passages who had not looked into Scaliger's preface to his great work might very well wonder both why anyone had said that Varro, of all people, was Scaliger's predecessor in writing an art of poetry, and why Scaliger, who was an admirer of Aristotle, should claim to have been the first to apply philosophical concepts to the study of poetic theory. To be sure, Scaliger says later on that Aristotle is fragmentary and neglects the order of the subject but this is not the same thing as saying his approach to poetry was non-philosophical. It would not be until one had read Scaliger's preface from the beginning that he would discover that both of these remarks refer to Scaliger's Latin grammar, *De Causis linguae latinae*.⁵ Then light would break. Of course Varro would be the person whom people would say Scaliger had copied since Varro is best known for his *De Lingua latina*. And if Scaliger says that Scaliger is the first to have written a scientific grammar of the Latin language he is on fairly firm ground. Harry Thurston Peck in his *History of Classical Philology* calls Scaliger's *De Causis linguae latinae*, "the first known scientific Latin grammar."⁶ The remarks cited by Saintsbury and Baldwin about Aristotle, Horace and Vida come further on in the letter and do, in truth, introduce what Scaliger is going to say about his own *Poetics*.

The fact that both the prefatory letter to *De Causis linguae latinae* and that to the *Poetices libri septem* are addressed to Sylvius, and that the two works were both written, according to their author, for the instruction of his beloved son, makes it difficult to understand the second letter until one has glanced at the first. The preface of *De Causis* . . . begins:

Now, Sylvius, that you have passed out of the difficulties of more elementary literature, it is not proper that you undertake the more serious studies

sincerely trust that no one will consider this correction of what, after all, is a minor slip as an attack on the late Professor Baldwin's scholarship since I am well aware of the very real value of his books.

⁵ *Causis* is untranslatable but if I had to give an English title to the book, I should call it *The Laws of the Latin Language*.

⁶ (New York, 1911), p. 322. The emphasis is Peck's. John Edwin Sandys calls the *De Causis linguae latinae* "an acute and judicious work on the leading principles of the language. . . ." *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1908), II, 178.

before knowing the reasons for the particular rules; for through them the scope of each and every important field of learning has had to be revealed.⁷

The father goes on to say that unless he felt able to exempt his son from the usual difficulties with Latin grammar, he would feel that life was very bitter indeed.

With this as background it is easier to avoid the possibility of misinterpreting the preface to the *Poetics* since this second letter to Sylvius begins with a clear reference to the previous one and shows that the *De Causis* and the *Poetics* may be considered as two steps in the education this learned father wants his son to have.

The preface to the *Poetics* commences:

We have already taken pains, Sylvius, that you should enjoy the most carefully selected instructions for the first rudiments of letters. Now it remains that you should be led by no common road to the higher studies that come after. This will be a task that will be greater in proportion as the latter studies are more important than the former.⁸

But, instead of turning to these higher studies at once, Scaliger has to answer the criticisms that have been made of his Latin grammar, and he spends almost half the letter doing this. He says that those who had hitherto ruled the Empire of Letters resented having to learn their grammar all over again, so that they could teach it properly. These people criticized Scaliger's book from two contradictory points of view. One school said it was too superficial and the other said that the subject matter was too lowly to be treated so profoundly, especially since it was admittedly written for an adolescent.⁹

⁷ "Praefatio," *De Causis linguae latinae*. "Egressum te ex angustiis tenuioris literaturae, SYLVI CAESAR fili, non ante decet inire rationem grauiorum studiorum, quàm istarum praeceptionum caussas notas habeas, per quas excellentissimae cuiusque scientiae cursus aperiri debuit." Professor William Stuart Messer was kind enough to look over my translations from the Latin in this paper and to give me suggestions for certain better ways of rendering some Latin phrases.

⁸ All translations from the *Poetics* in this paper are from a complete English version being undertaken by Rossiter Bellinger and myself. "Praefatio in Libros Poetices, "f. iir. "Postquam nostra cura, Sylvi, factum est, vt ad prima rudimenta literarum lectissimis praeceptionibus vterè: nunc reliquum est, ut ad consequentia studia non vulgari via perducaris, tantò maiore opera, quò haec sunt illis grauiora."

⁹ Sylvius was ten years old when the *De Causis* . . . was published.

He then continues:

The fact that the laws of the Latin language, which had remained unknown to all the centuries previous, had been extracted from the secret treasures of nature was what inflamed these worthless and indolent critics, not the lowliness of my effort, as some say in criticism, or its flamboyance, as others proclaim. For let those who from some unhappy ignorance thought that Varro too had labored in this field know this: neither he nor anyone of his time could have ever undertaken this work, much less have completed it.¹⁰

Scaliger once more replying to those who said his grammar was too simple repeats that he wrote for an adolescent, and says that his great contribution has been to apply the ordinances of philosophy to the art of grammar. That he means his *De Causis* . . . and not his *Poetics* is abundantly clear by what follows: "Now I have a question for those Palaemons. By whose edict was it ordered that I should refrain from healing the ulcers caused by those diseased explanations of theirs which have poisoned the minds of youths?"¹¹ Since Palaemon was a man with an evil reputation, who taught grammar (in the modern sense) at Rome in the first century A. D., Scaliger's dubbing his opponents with this name proves, as does what follows, that they were critics of his *De Causis* . . . , not of his *Poetics*, which had not even issued from the press. It is difficult to imagine Scaliger answering criticisms of a book which he had not yet published. Scaliger, then, boasts of having like a new Hercules held these new Antaeuses off the earth, which gave them renewed strength for their factionalism, until he choked them to death.

At long last, half way through the preface, Scaliger begins to speak to Sylvius about the *Poetics* he has written for him. He says that now that Sylvius is versed in fundamentals, it is time that he should be taught logic and oratory. This is especially important, he feels, since Sylvius is preparing to practice Law. Law,

¹⁰ "Praefatio in Libros Poetices," f. iiv. "Vrere id eorum ignauiam atque supinitatem, quum ex naturae penitissimis thesauris erutae sunt causae linguae Latinae, quae omnibus antea saeculis ignotae fuissent, non operam nostram, vel vt illi premebant abiectam, vel vt hi ventilabant, luxuriantem. Nam qui putarunt, nescio qua fatali levitate sua, Varronem quoque illa molitum esse: sciant, neque illum, neque illius temporis vllum vel solos conatus ad talem operam praestare potuisse."

¹¹ *Ibid.*, f. iiii. "Et quaero de istis Palaemonibus, si definire audent, quo, cuius edicto, non audebimus nos mederi vomitibus earum definitionum, quae venenarunt animos adolescentum?"

he says, is more than obstinacy or a great number of citations. It is established for the harmony and justice of mankind, and the student of law learns good principles, not only from studying philosophy, but from reading the historians and the poets. "Those who condemn such reading are boorish, insensible, and harshly arrogant men who are not worthy to be placed in the category of human beings."¹²

Poetry, he goes on, has existed coeternally with nature itself. Poetry is found in the songs of birds when they harmonize among themselves and make equal their inequality by a mutual exchange of sound, and in the movements of the heavenly bodies. Poetry is that which "animates matter itself, being a rhythmical harmony of unlike movements which are held in the modulations of the most trifling speech."¹³

It is to help Sylvius in this divine study that Scaliger has undertaken this difficult task. Although some might think he had been aided by his predecessors, they were an inspiration rather than a help, since Horace's *Ars Poetica* teaches artlessly, Aristotle's commentaries are fragmentary, and Vida merely instructs a poet who is already a poet. Thus, Scaliger stakes out his claim to be the first constructor of a complete theory of poetry. He particularly feels proud that he is the first to arrange the subject matter significantly.

If Sylvius now trains himself in these things, he may become the example to his younger brothers that his father had been to him.¹⁴ For Sylvius need not listen to the "bloodsuckers of good fame" who say such studies are a waste of time and that one should devote oneself to the more serious and more practical branches of knowledge.

Scaliger ends with a splendid plea for the values of humane studies:

So, then, this is the task we set for ourselves. While they devote their years to dice, or gape at gold, or snatch at civil offices, or as sycophants

¹² *Ibid.*, f. iiiv. "... quam qui damnarunt, agresti atque aspero supercilio bruti homines, ne in hominum quidem censu reponendi sunt."

¹³ *Ibid.*, f. iiir. "... quae materias ipsas animet numerosa concordia dissimilium momentorum, quae in levissimae dictionis flexibus continentur."

¹⁴ Sylvius' younger brothers were: Audectus Caesar, who died young; the great Joseph, born in 1540; Leonard, born in 1541; and John Constant, born in 1544.

at the tables discuss military strategy among the dishes; we shall seem neither to have scorned their pleasures nor to have found fault with their ambition, but rather to have been unwilling to be censured for the nobility of our pursuits and the greatness and honesty of our minds.¹²

VERNON HALL, JR.

Dartmouth College

POSSIBLE ADDITIONS TO THE CHURCHILL CANON

The statement of Andrew Kippis, editor of the *Biographia Britannica*, that Charles Churchill published several "juvenile pieces" in the poetry section of *The Library*, which he and his friend Robert Lloyd directed for several months, has been ignored.¹ Kippis could hardly have been mistaken about Churchill's contributions to *The Library*, since he was its editor. His statement at least justifies an attempt to determine whether any of the poems in the magazine may be attributed to Churchill.

One or more poems were published in each monthly issue of *The Library, or Moral and Critical Magazine* from its first number in April, 1761, to its last, May, 1762. The name or initials of the authors of some are given; others are unsigned. Neither Churchill's name nor his initials appear. The attribution of any of them to him, then, must rest largely on internal evidence. Although such attribution is sometimes dangerous, Churchill's known work is so homogeneous in subject matter, style, and versification that fair probability may be achieved, especially since the number of poems

¹² "Praefatio in Libros Poeticos," f. iiiiv-[1] "Quare porro danda est opera nobis, ut dum illi ad aleam aetatem transmittunt, aut inhiant auro, aut captant magistratus, aut mensarum asseclae de bellorum summa disputant inter patinas: nos neque illorum voluptates contempsisse, neque ambitiones carpsisse, sed studiorum nostrorum nobilitatem, animorum magnitudinem simul, & simplicitatem, perstringi noluisse videamur."

Scaliger tells in another place that there was no one in Agen with whom he could speak of literary matters. When friends dropped in, the conversation was always of wars, storms, politics, horses and hunting. He did not find fault with these colloquies, but was always happy to return to his books. (*Adversus Desiderium Erasmus orationes duae*, Toulouse, 1621, Oration, II, 38-39.)

¹ Andrew Kippis, *Biographia Britannica*, second ed. (1778), III, 581.

to be considered is small and since the field may be narrowed still further by the immediate elimination of many of them, including all those signed.

The imitation of Horace's *Epistle XIII, Book 1*, "by a Gentleman of Trinity College, Cambridge" (October, 1761), and *Il Solitario* (May, 1761), by the same author, are obviously not Churchill's, since he was never enrolled at Trinity College. It is not likely that he was the translator of three of Frederick the Great's poems published in the January, February, and April issues of 1762; nothing in their subject matter or style suggests Churchill, and there is no evidence of his interest in Frederick the Great's writing. It is also unlikely that he wrote an *Epistle from the Country, to a Friend in Town* (May, 1762); he was in London at that time, and the praise of country life in the poem is not characteristic of Churchill. A number of short *jeux d'esprit*, some of which are addressed to "Celia," which appear in several issues of *The Library*, are unlike any known work of his and may be disregarded. So may an *Elegy* (October 1761), an obvious imitation of Gray's *Elegy*; Churchill's low opinion of Gray is presumptive evidence that he would not have been likely to imitate him.

Of the remaining poems in *The Library*, a strong case may be made for the attribution of at least two to Churchill. One is the *Epistle to R. L. L.* (June, 1761). The initials almost certainly indicate Robert Lloyd, his closest friend and his collaborator in directing the magazine's poetry section. The poem is in iambic tetrameter couplets, one of the two verse forms Churchill is known to have used. The ideas expressed, including the attack on the servility of critics, the contempt for poetic rules, the insistence on the value of modern literature, and the exaltation of Shakespeare above the ancients, are found in other works of his, notably *The Rosciad*, published three months earlier, in which he had put these sentiments in the mouth of Lloyd. Stylistically, too, the poem is like Churchill's other works: the lines are occasionally rough, and his common device of introducing an implied dialogue to further his argument is used in lines 49-50 and 65-6. The reference to the poem as "these my virgin rhimes" (l. 69) is in harmony with Kippis's description of his poems in *The Library* as "juvenile pieces." The time of publication, too, seems significant: Churchill had established his reputation with *The Rosciad* in March; it seems

probable that he was using his newly won position to publish an earlier unsuccessful work.

The text of the *Epistle* follows:

EPISTLE TO R. L. L.

No happy aera e'er was known,
 So full of writers, as our own;
 While few can boast a lawful claim,
 To present, or to future fame.
 Rhimes they may make, such, ten to one,
 As ——— or as ——— have done;
 But have as poets, no pretence,
 Unless they set the stamp of sense.
 The clinquant ring of tinsel sound,
 Unto the ear is pleasing found; 10
 But sense gives value to the whole,
 Rhime is the body, sense the soul.

Nor yet can ev'ry wight of sense,
 A poet instantly commence.
 'Tis not a long dull train of thought,
 Into smooth numbers coldly wrought,
 Can give a title to that name,
 Which few deserve, but many claim.
 No, there is something more required,
 Bards, to be bards, must be inspired. 20
 The man, who truly loves and woos
 The favour of the heav'n-born muse,
 Must from her fury catch the flame,
 And in his bosom feel the same:
 That spark, which as the ancients say,
 To animate the new-made clay,
 PROMETHEUS stole, must fill his breast,
 And blaze with warmth divine confest.
 Then borne on wings of fire, he quits
 The servile track of critick wits; 30
 Rejects the doctrines of the schools,
 And soars beyond the reach of rules; *

* Cf. Cold-blooded critics, by enervate sires
 Scarce hammer'd out, when Nature's feeble fires
 Glimmer'd their last; whose sluggish blood, half froze,
 Creeps labouring through the veins; whose heart ne'er glows
 With fancy-kindled heat;—a servile race,
 Who in mere want of fault, all merit place;
 Who blind obedience pay to ancient schools,
 Bigots to Greece, and slaves to musty rules;

Leaving those laws to be obey'd
By fools, which first by fools were made.

The sons of GREECE and ROME thus fir'd
Urg'd on their way, to fame aspir'd;
Their course with noble ardour run.
And wore the laurels which they won.

Thus fir'd, the sons of Britain feel
An equal, or a greater zeal; ³
The flying prize as ardent press
With more desert, but less success.
Envy our judgment leads astray,
And prejudices bar their way;
Else why are critick herds misled
To tear the crown from SHAKESPEARE's head,
Which they would only have to grow
And bloom on an Athenian brow.
SHAKESPEARE! A modern!—well what then?
Moderns, my learned sir, are men; 40
And when you've set forth all your store,
What were the mighty ancients more?
What great enchantment's in the sound
Of ROME or ATHENS to be found

That they unto themselves should claim
This grand monopoly of fame? ⁴
What is their plea, and, fairly try 'em,
Wherefore is HOMER more than I am?
Not because fate it chanc'd to please,
That HOMER should be born in GREECE; 60
His merit would have been as great
If born in any other state; ⁵

-
- ³ Cf. May not some great extensive genius raise
The name of Britain 'bove Athenian praise;
And whilst brave thirst of fame his bosom warms,
Make England great in letters as in arms?

The Rosciad, 213-16.

- ⁴ Cf. Where do these words of Greece and Rome excel,
That England may not please the ear as well?
What mighty magic's in the place or air,
That all perfection needs must centre there?

The Rosciad, 201-4.

- ⁵ Cf. Genius is of no country; her pure ray
Spreads all abroad, as general as the day;
Foe to restraint, from place to place she flies,
And may hereafter e'en in Holland rise.

The Rosciad, 207-10.

Nor doth he disjoint all our noses,
Because he wrote as soon as MOSES.
Almost as soon; well, let it be
Great adept in chronology:

I never shall perplex my pate
About the trifle of a date,
Nor vitiate these my virgin rhimes,
With settling an account of times. 70
Was he to write some ages hence,
He would not have a grain less sense;
And had he ages wrote before,
Doubtless he would not have had more.
Born at what place or time you will,
HOMER would have been HOMER still.
His Spirit must have been the same;
He might indeed have chang'd his name:
In ENGLAND born, perhaps had known
The name of MILTON for his own; 80
Whilst MILTON, if a son of GREECE,
Had in return made use of his:
And ('tis a point I must maintain
Against the antiquated vein
Of supercilious critic pride),
The gain had been on HOMER's side.

Far be it from my thoughts to tread
Irreverent o'er the learned dead;
Envious to lessen their renown,
And tear the sacred trophies down. 90
With something like a filial zeal
Their works I read, admire, and feel;
But if their merit I confess,
Makes that the modern's merit less?
Or doth it follow because they
Have purchas'd honour in their day,
That I (a consequence most fine!)
Mayn't purchase equal fame in mine?
Must my ambition be confin'd,
And lag contentedly behind; 100
With superstitious awe adore
The virtues which have gone before,
And yet not dare, or dare in vain,
Attempt those virtues to obtain?
The son who struck with servile fears,
His parents excellence reveres,
But thinks it an unduteous deed

Should he their excellence exceed,
 And therefore at a distance views,
 Admires his track, but not pursues,
 Can in good reason only have
 The name of an admiring slave;
 Whilst that brave youth, and that alone,
 Truly deserves the name of son,
 Who when a parent's worth is known,
 Can't rest until it is his own,
 Nor stop, inflam'd with virtue's fire,
 But dares be better than his sire.*

110

Another poem which may be Churchill's is a short epigram published in *The Library* in May, 1761, under the title "On Reading in the News Papers that the PLAYERS had given a Benefit to a distressed Clergyman" (Written by a Clergyman):

What fine discourses, each revolving year,
 On CHARITY from our DIVINES we hear!
 The gift of Charity so little theirs,
 They send a starving BROTHER to the PLAYERS!
 "And who, says Garrick, wonders at the fact?
 "Who knows not *Priests can talk, and Players act?*"†

Observe that the author is said to be a clergyman, that the poem is in one of Churchill's two known verse forms, and that there is a reference to Garrick and the other players. Churchill had praised Garrick highly in *The Rosciad* in March, 1761, and in the following month had sharply attacked him in *The Apology*. Garrick almost immediately sought a reconciliation and with the help of Lloyd effected one. The exact chronology of the quarrel and reconciliation is not known, but this poem, appearing in the month following *The Apology*, may have been intended as a friendly gesture in response to Garrick's overtures. The slighting reference to the clergy would, of course, have been entirely characteristic of Churchill.

EDWARD H. WEATHERLY

University of Missouri

* *The Library*, I (1761), 152-4.

† *Ibid.*, 104.

EDWARD YOUNG AND WYCOMBE ELECTION

Edward Young wrote to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu on March 1, 1726: "I am obliged to go down to-morrow to *Wycombe election*, which is on Thursday; as soon as I return, I will wait on your ladyship." Young's errand at Wycombe has not been identified by his biographers. W. Thomas, author of the fullest biography of Young, merely conjectures that Young may have rendered there some political service possibly related to his receipt of a crown pension shortly afterwards.² It is possible to identify the election mentioned in the letter and to reconstruct Young's errand.

The election held at Wycombe on Thursday, March 3, 1726 was one in a series of disputed parliamentary elections in Wycombe which reflected Walpole's effort to control the House of Commons. An election held at Wycombe on February 1, 1726, to supply a vacancy had returned Charles Collyer.³ Harry Waller, the defeated candidate, had petitioned the election, charging illegal conduct on the part of local officials in Collyer's favor.⁴ Debate in the House on Waller's petition had developed into an attack by the Opposition on Walpole's electioneering methods, as the Tories supported Waller and the Administration upheld Collyer. The Opposition had prevailed, and a new election at Wycombe had been ordered and appointed for March 3.

The election on March 3 again resulted in the return of Collyer. Again Waller petitioned, charging that at this election the poll list was padded to give Collyer a majority of voters, that inspection of

¹ *The Letters and Works of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ed. Lord Wharnccliffe, rev. W. Moy Thomas (London, 1887), II, 15-16.

² W. Thomas, *Le Poète Edward Young* (Paris, 1901), p. 111: "La lettre mentionne . . . une élection parlementaire à Wycombe . . . où le poète doit aller le lendemain, peut-être pour y rendre quelque service politique au gouvernement. Quoiqu'il en soit, ses efforts littéraires ou autres étaient appréciés en haut lieu, car il reçut . . . une pension royale . . . la seule, fait remarquer Maucaulay, que le ministre Walpole ait apparemment accordé à un homme de lettres."

³ Charles Egerton, M. P. from Wycombe, had died November 7, 1725. Egerton had defeated Harry Waller in the elections of 1722; Waller had petitioned that election unsuccessfully.

⁴ *Journals of the House of Commons*. 12 Geo. I. February 7, 1725 (OS).

the poll list was denied to Waller and his supporters, and that the postmaster dispersed the voters as soon as Collyer was declared elected by illegally reading the Riot Act.⁵ Again the Administration supported Collyer's side, but again Waller's petition was upheld. This time Waller's name was ordered substituted for Collyer's on the Wycombe returns, and the town officials held responsible for the original return of Collyer's name were tried and imprisoned.⁶ The hearings on Waller's petition of the March 3 election intensified public interest in the whole series of incidents, which had become by this time a contemporary scandal.⁷

A pamphlet evidently written in support of Waller accused "a noble Lord, a Stranger of the Borough" of coming to Wycombe to manage the election of March 3 in Collyer's favor and thus, clearly, in favor of Walpole and the Administration.⁸ Edward Young's connection with that election suggests the identity of this "noble Lord." Young's friend, associate, and literary patron in 1726 was George Bubb Dodington, an active borough-master and supporter of Walpole. Dodington was Young's only link with practical Walpolian politics at this time: Wharton, who had been his patron in 1722 when Young had stood unsuccessfully for Parliament, was by 1726 in political oblivion; and Young had taken orders in 1724 on expectation of ecclesiastical preferment.⁹ Moreover, Dodington

⁵ *Journals of the House of Commons*. 12 Geo. I. March 8, 1725 (OS). A hearing on Waller's petition was held on March 17, 1726.

⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons*. 12 Geo. I. March 17, 18, 1725 (OS); April 5, 6, 7, 1726. The mayor of Wycombe and the postmaster were committed to Newgate, where they remained about two weeks. What was evidently an Administration effort to protect them shows in the record in the form of a motion to adjourn, which was offered in the midst of their trial in the House.

⁷ Cf. a letter in the Portland Mss. dated March 16: "No other news of any kind. Hampden's petition and Wycombe election, both very scandalous, are the only subject of talk." (*Historical Mss. Commission. Report on the Mss. of the Duke of Portland*, VII, 431.)

⁸ "Wycombe Election," reprinted as an appendix in John Parker, *The Early History and Antiquities of Wycombe in Buckinghamshire* (Wycombe, 1878). See p. 100.

⁹ See a letter from Young to Thomas Tickell reprinted in Richard E. Tickell's *Thomas Tickell and the Eighteenth Century Poets* (London, 1931), p. 105. The publication of a series of letters from Young to Tickell in this volume has settled the question of the date and circumstances of Young's ordination.

seems to have been familiar with the details of this Wycombe election at the time,¹⁰ and much later in his life he was to be accused of trying to manage another Wycombe election.¹¹ If Dodington was the "noble Lord" who managed the election of March 3 in the interest of the Administration, then Young's errand in Wycombe on March 3, 1726 was to fill the normal eighteenth century role of clergyman in the train of his patron.¹²

The election of March 3 at Wycombe was of more than ordinary importance to Walpole. The likelihood that Young was present in the train of Dodington supports Thomas' conjecture that the grant to Young of a crown pension may have been related to the errand mentioned in Young's letter to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Thomas' alternative conjecture, that the pension may have rewarded literary efforts, is not similarly supported.

CHARLOTTE E. CRAWFORD

Morgan State College,
Baltimore

DIRECT ECHOES OF FRENCH POETRY IN STEFAN GEORGE'S WORKS

Stefan George's early association with the young symbolist poets and their master Mallarmé clarified and, occasionally, directed his own poetic aims. Besides, some French verses seem to have found

¹⁰ To Dodington, an under-secretary of the Treasury, John Scrope, the Secretary, wrote on September 20, 1726: "I wish we dont, like Waller, spend more money to get one borough thann would buy half a score" (*Historical Mss. Commission. Report on Mss. in Various Collections*, vi. *Mss. of Miss M. Eyre Matcham*, p. 5). On October 4, Scrope again wrote Dodington, "A county election is a frightful thing. . . ." (*Ibid.*)

¹¹ The Earl of Bute wrote Dodington, then Lord Melcombe, on June 15, 1761: "It has been asserted to Lord Shelburn that your lordship attempted to supply his vacancy in Wycomb without his knowledge" (*Historical Mss. Commission. Report on Mss. in Various Collection*, vi. *Mss. of Miss M. Eyre Matcham*, p. 49). Lord Shelburn, who had been M.P. from Wycombe, was raised to the peerage on May 20, 1760.

¹² Cf. Edward Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons* (Cambridge, 1903), I, 296: "Every considerable eighteenth century borough-master had clergymen in his train. This was the case with . . . Dodington in the reign of George II." References to Dodington's *Diary* (pp. 256, 260, 307) are later than the period in which Young is known to have been attached to Dodington's household.

a direct echo in his poetry. E. L. Duthie, in her well-informed book,¹ has enumerated several passages that George seems to have taken over from Baudelaire and Albert Saint-Paul; we, therefore, restrict ourselves only to such passages as are not mentioned in Miss Duthie's book.

The Parnassian poets' usage of color and sound was continued by the symbolists and by George. George's title of a poem, *Weisser Gesang*,² reflects, perhaps, Gautier's *Symphonie en blanc majeur*. George's *Wir werden heute nicht zum garten gehen*³ and Théodore de Banville's beginning of a poem:

Nous n'irons plus au bois, les lauriers sont coupés.
Les Amours des bassins, les Naiades en groupe. . . .⁴

are similar in theme, some of the words, and, above all, the atmosphere of sadness and subdued resignation.

During his very first stay in Paris George decided to translate Baudelaire. It is natural, that *Les Fleurs du Mal*, which became part of his life's work, left a deep impression on George's own poetry. The *Einladung*⁵ recalls Baudelaire's *Invitation au Voyage*:⁶ in both poems the flight from the ugly city is glorified in the quick rhythm of short lines. Again, *Entführung*, with the opening line *Zieh mit mir geliebtes kind*,⁷ makes one think of Baudelaire's *Mon enfant, ma soeur* from the above-mentioned poem.

In George's earliest series of poems, *Zeichnungen in Grau*, which shows the first distinct traces of his contact with the French poets, there is many a passage that betrays Baudelaire's influence:

Und so wollt ich finden
Die weise Lasterreiche
Mit zerstörenden künsten:
Wollte mit offenen armen

¹ E. L. Duthie, *L'Influence du symbolisme français dans le renouveau poétique de l'Allemagne* (Paris: H. Champion, 1933), pp. 232 ff.

² Stefan George, *Das Jahr der Seele*, p. 66. We quote throughout from the *Gesamt-Ausgabe* (Berlin: Georg Bondi).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴ Théodore de Banville, *Œuvres* (Paris: Lemerre, 1889), p. 14.

⁵ George, *Hymnen, Pilgerfahrten, Algalal*, p. 16.

⁶ Charles Baudelaire, *Les Fleurs du Mal* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1925), p. 84.

⁷ George, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

In mein unheil rennen
Wie ein rasender lieben
Mich ganz verderben
Und bald des todes sein.⁸

Mit jener unleugbaren hässlichkeit
Die des lasters majestät ist.⁹

These passages breathe Baudelairean spirit, and similar tones will never be found again in George's work. In *Wechsel*,¹⁰ also of his early period, again and again the hair is praised as the one beautiful attribute of the beloved. One could think of Baudelaire's *La Chevelure*.¹¹ The line *Aus künstlichem himmel mich reissen*¹² seems to be a direct translation of Baudelaire's book title *Les Paradis artificiels*.

In George's mature work, too, Baudelairean conceptions and rhythms can be found:

Ich bin der Eine und bin Beide
Ich bin der zeuger bin der schooss
Ich bin der degen und die scheide
Ich bin das opfer bin der stoss . . .¹³

Je suis la plaie et le couteau!
Je suis le soufflet et la joue!
Je suis les membres et la roue,
Et la victime et le bourreau!¹⁴

Then we find lines with a precise correspondence in metre and rhythm, although the contents is different:

Je suis l'Ange gardien, la Muse et la Madone¹⁵
Ich bin freund und führer dir und ferge.¹⁶

Significantly the female principle of Baudelaire has been transposed into a male principle.

Several passages in Baudelaire contain an enumeration of rare

⁸ George, *Die Fibel*, p. 93.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

¹¹ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

¹² George, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

¹³ George, *Der Stern des Bundes*, p. 27.

¹⁴ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

¹⁶ George, *Der Teppich des Lebens*, p. 20.

things, with a definite center of gravity in the last words of the line:

De l'huile de coco, du musc et du goudron.¹⁷
Où tout n'est qu'or, acier, lumière et diamants.¹⁸
Tout se fera Benjoin, Encens, Oliban, Myrrhe.¹⁹

One cannot help hearing at the same time George's lines:

Den geist von amber weihrauch und zitronen.²⁰
Aus demant alabaster und kristall.²¹
Und werden lorbeer tee und aloe.²²

Especially *se fera* and *werden* are completely parallel. Before George there were hardly any similar lines in Germany poetry.

Perhaps this initial verse sounded in George's ear:

Je veux te raconter, ô molle enchanteresse,²³

when he, also as a first line, wrote:

Ich will mir jener stunden lauf erzählen.²⁴

The situation of a struggle between the poet and the angel, bringer of the severe law, dominates George's *Vorspiel*, whereas Baudelaire wrestles with the devil:

Und aller wachen sehnsucht stimmen schreien:
Ich lasse nicht, du segnest mich denn.²⁵
Il n'est pas une fibre en tout mon corps tremblant
Qui ne crie: O mon cher Belzébuth, je t'adore.²⁶

Again, in Baudelaire's *Le Rebelle*, an *Ange furieux* announces to the poet:

. . . Tu connaîtras la règle!
(Car je suis ton bon Ange, entends-tu?) Je le veux!²⁷

In George's *Vorspiel* the poet does not become a rebel. He subordinates himself to the Angel and accepts those rules that can be regarded as George's *ars poetica*:

¹⁷ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

²⁰ George, *Hymnen*, p. 93.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²³ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

²⁴ George, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

²⁵ George, *Teppich*, p. 15.

²⁶ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

Nun spricht der Ewige: ich will! ihr sollt! ²⁸
 Nun tu ich alles was der engel will. ²⁹

Whereas Baudelaire, *poète maudit*, answers:

Mais le damné répond toujours: "Je ne veux pas." ³⁰

Bruno Adriani has drawn the attention to the similarity of image and sound between two other passages: ³¹

Berceuse dont la main aux longs sommeils m'invite. ³²
 Blumen der frühen heimat nickten draussen
 Und luden schaukelnd ein zum langen schlummer. ³³

Furthermore one might find a certain similarity in contents between Baudelaire's *Bénédiction* and George's *Sprüche für die Geladenen in T*. Both poems speak of the malediction of the poet at his birth. The similarity is more pronounced in the earlier French version, *Proverbes*. The godmother's gifts of the "fée maligne" are:

Elle te donne comme étrennes
 Ces yeux sinistres et si mornes. ³⁴

George's own German version, that speaks of "augen so trüb und sonder," made milder that Baudelairean "sinistre," because the poet, at that time, felt no longer that he was *maudit*. Another originally French poem, *D'une veillée*, takes up the theme of Baudelaire's *Bénédiction*:

Tes lèvres (elles sont muettes) content le drame
 Des âmes que Dieu condamne. ³⁵

A last similarity between Baudelaire and George is of a metrical nature, or rather metrical and syntactical, and belongs probably to the chapter of the influence of the Alexandrine on German poetry. A certain type of measured line strikes us again and again as one of the definite characteristics of George's poetic style:

²⁸ George, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³⁰ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

³¹ Bruno Adriani, *Baudelaire und George* (Berlin: Riemerschmidt, 1939), p. 62.

³² Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

³³ George, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

³⁴ George, *Schlussband*, p. 134.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

Erhellet die weiher und die bunten pfade.³⁶
 Von nackter helle und von blassen düften.³⁷
 Von grabesgrünen und von sichrem heile.³⁸
 Den blauen raden und dem blutigen mohne.³⁹
 Ein stolzes beben und ein reiches schallen.⁴⁰
 Die kahlen mauern und die starren masten.⁴¹

Like George, Baudelaire often uses this architecturally harmonious verse as a last line so as to give a certain balance to the whole preceding poem:

Les miroirs ternis et les flammes mortes.⁴²

George translates faithfully:

Die trüben spiegel und die tote helle.⁴³

We believe that this translated line became the germ for all the other ones which are patterned according to this one. Examples in Baudelaire are:

Le langage des fleurs et des choses muettes.⁴⁴
 Le travail de mes mains et l'amour de mes yeux.⁴⁵
 L'univers moins hideux et les instants moins lourds.⁴⁶

Examining now George's relationship to passages from Mallarmé, it is hardly astonishing that the most striking parallel which we find, a direct translation, is not a line from Mallarmé's poems, but an expression belonging to his private life, as Mallarmé impressed George above all as the embodiment of the living poet. George signed some of his letters with "Ihre hand!";⁴⁷ which is a translation of Mallarmé's personal formula "Votre main." The other direct translation from the French is, of course, the title of the *Blätter für die Kunst*, translated after the model of *Les Ecrits pour l'Art*, the symbolist review. In George's title of the poem *Juli-*

³⁶ George, *Jahr*, p. 12.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴¹ George, *Die Bücher der Hirten- und Preisgedichte*, p. 100. Many similar verses could be added.

⁴² Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

⁴³ George, *Baudelaire-Umdichtungen*, p. 181.

⁴⁴ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴⁷ George, Hofmannsthal, *Briefwechsel* (Berlin: Bondi, 1938), p. 11.

*schwermut*⁴⁸ there seems to be a reminiscence of Mallarmé's *Tristesse d'été*. George's "In zeiten feucht und falb"⁴⁹ can be traced back to Mallarmé's "les siècles fauves"⁵⁰ in an almost direct translation. The noun "flug," with an adjective of color, is used just as unusually as in Mallarmé's

Des vols qui n'ont pas fui.⁵¹
Ce blanc vol fermé.⁵²
Aux noirs vols du Blasphème.⁵³
Dein zauber brach da blaue flüge wehten.⁵⁴

A comparison is possible between George's poem in prose, *Heim*, and Mallarmé's prose poem *Plainte d'automne*:

Es klingt von unten her die gassenweise der orgel die wir so oft bespottet die aber am herzen nagt.⁵⁵

. . . une orgue de Barbarie chanta languissamment et mélancoliquement sous ma fenêtre . . . un air suranné, banal: d'où vient que sa ritournelle m'allait à l'âme . . . ?⁵⁶

Mallarmé's *Apparition* was translated by George. The divine visitor

Passait, laissant toujours de ses mains mal fermées
Neiger de blancs bouquets d'étoiles parfumées.⁵⁷

The same theme, the apparition of a higher being bearing flowers and strewing them before the poet, recurs in the first poem of George's *Vorspiel*. In the first of the *Hymnen*, another apparition, Mallarmé's "mal fermées" may have contributed to George's "Halboffen ihre traumesschweren lider."⁵⁸ In his poem *Prose* Mallarmé speaks of the poet's turning toward an old grief to understand his sister, i. e. his soul, better; a situation reflected in *Das Jahr der Seele*:

. . . comme à l'entendre
J'occupe mon antique soin.⁵⁹
Mein heilig streben ist mich traurig machen
Damit ich wahrer deine trauer teile.⁶⁰

⁴⁸ George, *Teppich*, p. 75.

⁴⁹ George, *Jahr*, p. 68.

⁵⁰ Mallarmé, *Poésies*, 39th edition (Paris: Gallimard, 1931), p. 56.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁵⁴ George, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵⁵ George, *Tage und Taten*, p. 20.

⁵⁶ Mallarmé *Divagations* (Paris: Charpentier, 1935), p. 8.

⁵⁷ Mallarmé *Poésies*, p. 16.

⁵⁹ Mallarmé, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

⁵⁸ George, *Hymnen*, p. 13.

⁶⁰ George, *Jahr*, p. 30.

In *Prose* the accompanying soul becomes *docte* by wandering along with the poet, "Et docte déjà par chemins."⁶¹ In the *Jahr der Seele* the poet says to his companion:

Du sprichst mir nach in klugen silben,
Was mich erfreut im bunten buch.⁶²

Addressing a companion as "sister" is a familiar poetic device, frequent in Baudelaire's and Mallarmé's poems. But Mallarmé's "Mon âme vers ton front où rêve, ô calme soeur"⁶³ seems to have the same tone as George's "O schwester nimm den krug aus grauem thon."⁶⁴ Live things, especially eyes, were commonly compared to precious stones. George, also, uses this Parnassian comparison:

Ses yeux polis sont faits de minéraux charmants.⁶⁵
... et les yeux, semblables aux pierres rares.⁶⁶
Dein auge blau, ein türkis, leuchtet lange.⁶⁷

Could one perhaps see a reminiscence of Mallarmé's "les bois oubliés"⁶⁸ in George's beautiful innovation "totgesagter park?"⁶⁹ Or could Mallarmé's boldly shortened expression "L'adieu suprême des mouchoirs"⁷⁰ remind us of the also boldly condensed line of George, "Aus scheidestunden werden tränen rinnen,"⁷¹ that also speak of a farewell?

Kurt Wais, finally, points to the fact that the shipwreck, one of Mallarmé's central themes, also appears in one of George's prose poems.⁷²

WERNER VORDTRIEDE

Central Michigan College

⁶¹ Mallarmé, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁶² George, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁶³ Mallarmé, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁶⁴ George, *Hirtengedichte*, p. 11.

⁶⁵ Baudelaire, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁶⁶ Mallarmé, *Divagations*, p. 6.

⁷² Kurt Wais, *Mallarmé* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1938), p. 515.

⁶⁷ George, *Hymnen*, p. 32.

⁶⁸ Mallarmé, *Poésies*, p. 48.

⁶⁹ George, *Jahr*, p. 12.

⁷⁰ Mallarmé, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

⁷¹ George, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

CRISTÓBAL DE MESA AND TASSO'S *RIME*

Arturo Farinelli, in his brief essay on "Tasso in Ispagna,"¹ has called attention to the fact that Cristóbal de Mesa, one of the many Spanish poets who visited Italy at the end of the sixteenth century, was a great admirer of Torquato Tasso. He knew the Italian poet personally and was influenced by him ("Mas después que cinco años traté al Taso, El estilo mudé de otra manera"),² he wrote a limping Italian sonnet in his honor, to which Tasso graciously replied,³ and he used the *Gerusalemme liberata* as a model in writing his own heroic poems. But Cristóbal de Mesa has interest also as one of the Spanish authors who assiduously studied the Petrarchists of Italy and wrote sonnets in the Italian manner. I should like here to supplement Farinelli's remarks by pointing out that Mesa was among the first Spanish poets to make translations (without acknowledgment, of course, as was the fashion of the time) from Tasso's *Rime*. His first collection of *Rimas*, published at the end of the volume entitled *Valle de Lágrimas*, Madrid, Juan de la Cuesta, 1607 (1606),⁴ appeared only a few months after the first part of Pedro Espinosa's *Flores de poetas ilustres de España*, which includes among many flowers transplanted from Italy a first cluster of sonnets and madrigals from Tasso.⁵ Mesa inserts in his collection⁶ three sonnets taken from Torquato, none of which had been translated in the *Flores*:

¹ A. Farinelli, *Italia e Spagna*, Turin, Bocca, 1929, II, 237-86.

² *Rimas*, Madrid, A. Martin, 1611, p. 147v. (Published in the same volume as his *Patrón de España*. Copy in the library of the Hispanic Society of America.)

³ Tasso's sonnet, "Quei che con sommo studio il mondo ammira," was published by Mesa in his *Navas de Tolosa*, 1594, and again in his *Valle de Lágrimas*, 1606, and was reprinted by A. Solerti, *Vita di Torquato Tasso*, I, 690. It is not included in the various editions of Tasso's lyric verse.

⁴ I have used a microfilm reproduction of the copy of this work owned by the Hispanic Society of America. The date 1606 is given at the end of the volume.

⁵ See the notes in F. Rodríguez Marín's edition of the *Flores de poetas ilustres*, 1896; E. Mele, "Di alcune imitazioni tassiane di poeti spagnuoli," *Fanfulla della Domenica*, XXVI (1904), 34; C. B. Beall, "A Spanish Sonnet imitated from Tasso," *Hispania*, XXV (1942), 423-4.

⁶ Pp. 67v-69r.

Quando ya tus cabellos y tus ojos
 Pierdan el oro y llamas encendidas,
 Armas que vencen almas, vencen vidas,
 Causando glorias, y causando enojos.
 De ti llevando el tiempo los despojos,
 En mi estaràn tan frescas las heridas,
 De tus candidas manos homicidas,
 Que prometiendo flores, dan abrojos.
 Que despues de ti triunfen los años,
 Y tu espejo de Venus den al templo,
 Por lo que aun desde agora te lastimas.
 En recompensa de tan graues daños,
 Verás en mi de amor vn claro exemplo,
 Pues verás tu beldad viua en mis rimas.

Quando la edad, de bienes robadora,
 Trocare tu beldad, o gran vengança,
 Y ligera hiziere cruel mudança
 Del breue don con que te adorna agora.
 Y esse cabello, que tu frente dora
 Boluiere blanco el mal sin esperança,
 Y del rostro que grana, y nieue alcança
 Faltare el lustre de otra nueva Aurora.
 Quando (mal grado de tu ser) los años
 Den al tiempo de ti triunfos diuersos,
 Vista a mi, a quien tu luz tiene tan ciego.
 Siendo mi fè escudo en tantos daños,
 Tu hoguera mi pecho, y mi amor fuego,
 Renaceras qual Fenix en mis versos.

These are taken from two of Tasso's most popular pieces, which had already been imitated in England by Samuel Daniel (one of them through Desportes) and were soon to be combined into one by Mesa's friend Francisco de Medrano.⁷ The original text follows:

Quando avran queste luci, e queste chiome
 Perduto l'oro, e le faville ardenti:
 E l'arme de' begli occhi, or sì pungenti,
 Saran dal tempo rintuzzate, e dome.
 Fresche vedrai le piaghe mie, nè come
 In te le fiamme, in me gli ardori spenti;
 E rinnovando gli amorosi accenti,

⁷ See C. B. Beall, "Francisco de Medrano's Imitations from Tasso," *Hisp. Rev.*, XI (1943), 76-9. Luis Martín de la Plaza probably had both these sonnets in mind when he composed his "Ocasión de mis penas, Lidia ingrata," included in the *Flores* of Espinosa.

Alzerò questa voce al tuo bel nome.
 E 'n guisa di pittor, che 'l vizio emende
 Del tempo, mostrerò negli alti carmi
 Le tue bellezze in nulla parte offese.
 Fia noto allor, ch'allo spuntar dell'armi,
 Piaga non sana, e l'esca un foco apprende,
 Che vive, quando spento è chi l'accese.

Vedrò dagli anni in mia vendetta ancora
 Far di queste bellezze alte rapine:
 Vedrò starsi negletto, e bianco il crine,
 Che la natura, e l'arte increspa, e dora:
 E sulle rose, ond'ella il viso infiora,
 Spargere il verno poi nevi, e pruine;
 Così il fasto, e l'orgoglio avrà pur fine
 Di costei, ch'odia più, chi più l'onora.
 Sol penitenza allor di sua bellezza
 Le rimarrà, vedendo ogni alma sciolta
 Degli aspri nodi suoi, ch'ordìa per gioco.
 E se pur tanto or mi disdegna, e sprezza,
 Poi bramerà nelle mie rime accolta,
 Rinnovellarsi, qual Fenice, in foco.*

Another sonnet of Tasso's, which seems to have inspired no other foreign imitators, was Mesa's model for the following:

Gusta mi dama que la sirua, y ame,
 Y mientras su beldad mas reuerencio,
 Pone a mi grande amor freno, y silencio,
 So pena de no oyrme, aunque mas clame.
 No quiere que jamas suyo me llame,
 Y mi bien de mi mal no diferencio,
 Ved si mayor tormento dio Mezencio,
 Al mas fiero, al mas impio, al mas infame?
 Y peno, y sufro el mal, yo me consumo,
 Y no aliuio el dolor con los suspiros,
 Porque es mi fuego igual a su belleza.
 Y si a mas no poder saliere el humo,
 Y sangre de los golpes de sus tiros,
 Sola culpa tendra naturaleza.

Vuol, che l'ami costei; ma duro freno
 Mi pone ancor d'aspro silenzio. Or quale
 Avrò da lei, se non conosce il male,
 O medicina, o refrigerio almeno?
 E come esser potrà, ch'ardendo il seno

* *Opere di Torquato Tasso*, Florence, Tartini e Franchi, 1724, II, 266.

Non si dimostri il mio dolor mortale,
 Nel risplender di fiamma, a quella eguale,
 Ch'accende i monti in riva 'l mar Tirreno?
 Tacer ben posso, e tacerò: ch'io toglia
 Sangue alle piaghe, e luce al vivo foco
 Non brami già; questa è impossibil voglia.
 Troppo spinse pungenti a dentro i colpi,
 E troppo ardore accolse in picciol loco:
 S'apparirà, Natura, e sè n'incolpi.*

It may be well to note in conclusion that Mesa also translated (p. 103) Castiglione's famous sonnet, "Superbi colli e voi sacre ruine"; his version should take its place in the series of imitations so interestingly studied by Morel-Fatio in his "Histoire de deux sonnets."¹⁰

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

O SÔPRO DE DEUS

Em 1896 o insigne poeta português Guerra Junqueiro publicou o seu inspirado poema *A Patria*, bastante bem conhecido e apreciado até fora de Portugal, de maneira que excusado sera fazer aqui uma análise pormenorizada dêle.¹ Entre os conceitos brilhantes que abundam nesta obra mestre, cheia de côr e de força, há um que, mais que nenhum outro, deu motivo à crítica: refiro-me à personificação da alma portuguesa pelo papel dum doido. Enumera êste as façanhas heróicas do povo português na época da sua grandeza, a dos grandes descobrimentos e das conquistas de ilhas e de continentes inteiros além dos mares, conduzindo à fundação dum império quâsi mundial, o qual, infelizmente, se desvaneceu tão rápidamente como se tinha construído.²

* *Ibid.*, p. 272.

¹⁰ A. Morel-Fatio, *Etudes sur l'Espagne*, Paris, E. Bouillon, 1904, III, 141-52.

¹ A. F. G. Bell, *Studies in Portuguese Literature*, Oxford, 1914, p. 221 ss.

² *Auswahl von Guerra Junqueiros Gedichten*, herausgg. v. Luise Ey, Heidelberg, 1920, p. 88.

Cruz de Golgata em ferro traduzida,
 Minha espada de herói, ó cruz de morte,
 Cruz a que Deus baixou por nos dar vida;
 Vidas ceifando, desumana e forte
 Ergueste impérios, subjugando o Oriente,
 Mas Deus soprou . . . ei-los em nada. . . .

Desde o ponto de vista histórico, esta maneira de concebêr a queda do império português não é inteiramente exacta: o império português existe ainda. O que impediu que Portugal continuasse sendo uma Grande Potencia não foi uma catástrofe terrível tal como foi a destruição da Armada espanhola, em 1588, mais simplesmente a consequência natural da Revolução francesa que havia de conduzir à declaração da independência do Brasil.

Estas observações históricas em nada diminuem o esplendor da metáfora: Deus soprou . . . ei-los em nada. . . . O que, sem dúvida, merece uma notícia é que, no texto citado, o que parece ter inspirado o poeta foi a ruína do império espanhol, mais bem que a do império português. Com efeito, Guerra Junqueiro parece ter-se lembrado duma poesia de Schiller, bem conhecida e citada com frequência. Trata-se do poema sobre a destruição da Armada espanhola, escrito em 1786 e publicado na revista *Thalia* (II, 71). Citemos aqui a última estrofe:³

Gott der Allmächt'ge sah herab,
 Sah deines Feindes stolze Löwenflaggen wehen,
 Sah drohend offen dein gewisses Grab—
 Soll, sprach er, soll mein Albion vergehen,
 Erlöschen meiner Helden Stamm,
 Der Unterdrückung letzter Felsendamm
 Zusammenstürzen, die Tyrannenwehre
 Vernichtet sein von dieser Hemisphäre?
 Nie, rief er, soll der Freiheit Paradies,
 Der Menschenwürde starker Schirm verschwinden!
 Gott der Allmächt'ge blies,
 Und die Armada flog nach allen Winden.

Como é sabido, o poeta alemão aproveitou, para escrever aquela poesia, uma obra francesa intitulada *Portrait de Philippe II roi d'Espagne* de Mercier, publicada em 1785, a qual diz assim:

Le Tout-Puissant voulut conserver ce noble rempart de la liberté . . .
 Il souffla, et cette flotte invincible fut brisée et dispersée . . . Ces mots

³ *Die unüberwindliche Flotte* (Jubiläumsausgabe, I, 248 ss.).

. . . font allusion à la médaille que la reine Elisabeth fit frapper en mémoire de ce grand événement. On voyait au revers une flotte fracassée par la tempête, avec cette légende: *afflavit Deus et dissipati sunt*.⁴

A metáfora é de origem bíblica: veja-se *Exodo* (xv, 10): *Flavit spiritus tuus et operuit eos mare*, e *Jeremias* (xiii, 24): *Et deseminabo eos quasi stipulam, quae vento raptatur in deserto*.

E de notar-se que a atribuição dessa medalha à rainha Isabel é errônea: mais bem se trata duma medalha comemorativa da destruição da Armada espanhola derrotada em 1588, batida pelos Holandeses de Middelburg. Veem-se nesta medalha algumas naus lutando contra as ondas, com a inscrição: *Flavit Jehova et dissipati sunt. 1588*. O revés mostra um templo construído sobre um promontório com as armas do príncipe Maurício de Orange que ostentam a inscrição: *Allidor, non laedor*. O êrro de Mercier é devido ao ter seguido o escritor inglês Joseph Addison, o qual foi o primeiro quem atribuiu a medalha em questão à rainha Isabel.

Schiller, porém, não foi o primeiro poeta a adoptar aquela metáfora: o grande poeta francês Jean Racine já se tinha lembrado dela quando escreveu na sua nobre tragédia *Athalie*:

Comme le vent dans l'air dissipe la fumée,
La voix du Tout-Puissant a chassé cette armée.

Nem na Alemanha parece que Schiller fôra o primeiro poeta a adoptá-la. Numa poesia religiosa de Martim Crugot, poeta silesião da segunda metade do século XVIII^o, intitulada *O Cristão na Soledade*, publicado em Breslau em 1756, na qual ainda se trata da Armada espanhola lêmos: O Omnipotente soprou e dispersou à invencível como o vento dispersa a palha.⁵ E sabido que o poeta mais anterior mencionado por Schiller na primeira edição do seu poema é este mesmo Crugot, cuja poesia é, portanto, a fonte principal da *Armada invencível* de Schiller.⁶

Voltando ao poeta português, não há motivo para supôr que Guerra Junqueiro tivesse conhecido um ou o outro dos textos alemães ou franceses anteriores ao de Schiller. Pelo contrário, tudo indica que a sua única fonte foi a obra do grande poeta alemão, o qual, conhecido na Península por meio de traduções francesas e

⁴ Mercier, *Portrait de Philippe II roi d'Espagne*, Amsterdam, 1785, p. ix.

⁵ K. H. Manchot, *Martin Crugot, der ältere Dichter der unüberwindlichen Flotte Schillers*, Bremen, 1886, p. 23.

⁶ *Ed. cit.*, p. 349.

espanholas, foi para êle, sem dúvida, um modelo muito simpático, visto que nele encontramos o mesmo idealismo elevado, um pouco retórico, que caracteriza a musa de Guerra Junqueiro. Parece todavia que o poeta português ha reconhecido que uma transferência da nossa metáfora não fora inteiramente feliz: o sôpro de Deus, quer dizer o vento, pode esparramar e destruir uma armada e talvez (como nos versos de Racine) um exército; mas é difícil imaginar que possa produzir a ruina dum império mundial, ao menos diretamente. Por esta razão ha introduzido, parece, a expressão *ergueste*, que em efeito sugere a comparação do império português com uma torre ou outro edificio alto, que o vento pode muito bem derrotar. Não obstante, o conceito da queda do império português fica pouco histórico, observação com a qual começamos êste estudo.⁷

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, N. J.

OLD PROVENÇAL *BEDERESC*

The words *bederesc* and *bederesca* occur in a poem of Raïmbaut d'Aurenga (*Cars douz e feinz*; Bartsch 389, 22). As far as I can discover, they have never been explained. Levy (*Supplement-Wörterbuch*, I, 137 and VII, 666), who quotes the lines in question, leaves these words untranslated. So does Appel in his edition (*Raïmbaut von Orange*, pp. 86-94). But we are not without some indication of their meaning. Here is an abridged paraphrase of the stanza in which they occur: "The low song of the *bederesc* is dear and sweet to me, for it spreads out joyously and lives and grows. When the crickets sing on the wall, its voice falls lighter than cork; let none rise up there but the cricket or the *bederesca*." It is clear that *bederesc* designates a "bird or other singing creature," as Appel says (p. 89); *bederesca* is the corresponding feminine form.

⁷ A idéia que o vento é o sôpro de Deus é inteiramente bíblica e se acha, como m'informa o meu amigo, Dr. A. R. Nýkl, também no Alcorão. Cito também da obra d'Alphonse Daudet, *Lettres de mon moulin*, p. 26: [Um moleiro fala]: "Moi je travaille avec le mistral et la tramontane, qui sont la respiration du bon Dieu. . . ."

Now, there is a well-attested late Latin word *bitriscus*, which means "wren." This would suit admirably in Raïmbaut's poem. I suggest, therefore, that the words *bederesc* and *bederesca* are Provençal derivatives of this word.

Alice Brügger (pp. 36-37 of her thesis *Les noms du roitelet en France*, Zürich, 1922) gives several possible etymologies of *bitriscus*; but these, which are at best uncertain, need not detain us. It is enough that the word existed. Somewhat more interesting is the list (p. 36) of Latin variants of *bitriscus*, which she takes from the *Complément* to Rolland's *Faune populaire de la France* (1905). Among these is *biteriscus*, with an extra -e-, which is precisely the form we need for Provençal *bederesc*. Unfortunately, the *Complément* gives no hint of the source of these variants.

Bitriscus would normally have become something like **beiresc* in Provençal, but *biteriscus* could develop into *bederesc*. True, one would expect the unstressed -e- in this position to drop out; and we must confess that the form *bederesc* has a rather learned appearance. The vowel may have been retained, as Appel suggests (p. 89, though without reference to *bitriscus*), because of a fancied connection with Béziers, *Baeterrae*.

Miss Brügger (pp. 41 ff.) cites a number of modern dialect names for the wren which suggest descent from *bederesc*. Most of these have an initial *rey-* or the equivalent. Among them are *radébéré* (Cantal), *rébédéré* (Ardèche), *rebédédé* (Aveyron). It will be noticed that these localities are well within the limits of the southern dialects; so the filiation could be directly through *bederesc*. Miss Brügger thinks that *radébéré* is the older form, equivalent to *reybéré* with an intercalated *de*, since one ordinarily says "king of something." Then *rébédéré* would be the result of metathesis. My own feeling is that *rébédéré* goes back to **re-bederesc*, and that if there was any metathesis here it worked the other way—perhaps for the reason Miss Brügger suggests: it sounded more intelligible that way. It is interesting, in this connection, to consider several Lyonese variants which Miss Brügger presents, of the type *répétéré*, which she also connects with *bitriscus*, or *pitiscus*.

If, then, we find modern names for the wren like *ré-bédéré* and *ré-pétéré*, why not an older *bederesc*? I think we may safely add these entries to our Old Provençal lexicon:

bederesc, s. m., wren.

bederesca, s. f. (female) wren.¹

FRANK MCMINN CHAMBERS

Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colo.

THE FRANKLIN'S TALE, LINE 942

"Withouten coppe he drank al his penaunce."

The foregoing line has been variously interpreted. Citing as parallels only the occurrences of a similar idiom in the *Tale of Beryn*, W. W. Skeat glossed it "in full measure."¹ Presently H. B. Hinckley settled upon the sense, "under difficulties."² J. M. Manly, probably influenced also by the *Beryn*-passages, believed that the best rendering was, "got a beating."³ Professor F. N. Robinson, after admitting that "under difficulties" was a possibility, suggested as an alternative "in full draft."⁴

A good many related phrases may be found, most of them in French poetry either accessible to Chaucer or from shortly after his day.⁵ From these it is clear that none of the senses proposed is wholly satisfactory, for none of them covers all the cases. But from them all, one may satisfy himself as to how the phrase came to have a particular sense.

¹ I am indebted to Professor Leo Spitzer for certain suggestions in connection with this note. F. M. C.

² *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, v (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), 389; this interpretation was accepted by others, for instance G. H. Gerould, *Old English and Medieval Literature* (New York: Nelson, 1929), p. 229. The citations from *Beryn* are given at the end of this paper.

³ "Chauceriana," *Modern Philology* XVI (1918), 47. In his earlier *Notes on Chaucer* (1907), he described the passage as containing an "allusion not yet explained."

⁴ *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (New York: Holt, 1928), p. 607.

⁵ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1933), p. 828; all my quotations from Chaucer's works are from this text.

⁶ Several of these were discovered or listed by G. L. Kittredge in "The Authorship of the English *Romance of the Rose*," *Harvard University Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, I (1892), 32.

A proverbial way of saying that a person must take the consequences of his acts was that he must drink his own brew:

Let him habbe, ase he brew, bale to dryng.*
S'il fait folie, si la beive.⁷

This he must do, no matter how distasteful the beverage—even if it were his own sorrow:

For what I drye, or what I thynke,
I wil myselven al hyt drynke,
. . . As ferforth as I kan myn art.*
[Women's] wrecche is this, oure owen wo to drynke.⁸

Especially was it possible to drink the woes of love:

[You,] Qui tant en as beü d'angoisses,
Que touz en ies desfigurez.¹⁰
Teus genz beivent trop de mesaise.¹¹
Tu as gousté de son [Love's] buvrage.¹²

(The lover says at once that as a result, he is utterly wretched.) In Gower's *Confessio Amantis* is a lengthy passage in which the lover describes his experiences as though they had involved intoxicants: the various stages and aspects of love produce in him all the symptoms of hard drinking:¹³

* From the "Song Against the King of Almaine (Song of Lewes)," in *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*, edited by Carleton Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932), p. 131.

⁷ E. Langlois, *Le Roman de la Rose* (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français III, 1921), 12640. Cf. also the notion that something is brewed for mankind by a guardian spirit like Reason:

Dont est il bien fol qui refuse
La liqueur de quoy elle abeuve
Creature. (Jean Froissart, *Trésor Amoureux*, edited by Aug. Scheler [Brussels: Devaux, 1870-1876], III, 247.)

⁸ *The House of Fame*, 1879-1882.

⁹ *Troilus and Criseyde*, II, 784.

¹⁰ *Roman de la Rose*, 4264.

¹¹ *Roman de la Rose*, 11535 ff.

¹² Froissart, *Paradys d'Amours* (Scheler, I), 678.

¹³ Edited by G. C. Macaulay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), III, vi, 75-400.

[I] am so drunken of that sihte [of the lady].

And thanne [when away from my lady] I drinke a biter swete
With dreie lippe and yhen wete.

Of love, which min herte assaileth,
So drunke I am that mi wit failleth.

Now the usual term for the discomforts involved in falling in love without due encouragement was "penance" or "penitence";¹⁴ it of course implied suffering and torment:

Ennuy me fait vo souffrance,

Car penance

Avez empris et tourmente.¹⁵

Car je [a lover] sueffre grant penitance.¹⁶

[A lover who] A souffert grant penitance.¹⁷

[Dorigen] Hath swich a pitee caught of his penaunce.¹⁸

Pour ce [being in love] reçois, par saint Nicaise,

Grief penitance.¹⁹

Except in Chaucer's line, I know no example of "drinking penance"; yet if 'penance' had come to mean much the same thing as 'sorrow due to love,' then one may easily see how the word might come to be substituted for the phrase. Furthermore, if "penance" were to be drunk at all, the process would of course be purely internal, and no cup would be needed. Hence to "drink without the cup" would come to mean, 'suffer inwardly because of one's emotions.'

¹⁴ Like several terms much in the mouths of court poets, this was appropriated from the vocabulary of religion. Striking examples of this practice may be found in A. de Montaiglon's edition of *L'Amant Rendu Cordelier a l'Observance d'Amours* (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1881). Guillaume de Machaut seems to have avoided the practice; but Froissart had no aversion to it: see his *Trésor Amoureux*, XIX ff. (Scheler, III, 94).

¹⁵ Gaston Raynaud, *Les Cent Balades* (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1895), p. 137.

¹⁶ *Paradys d'Amours*, p. 568.

¹⁷ *Paradys d'Amours*, p. 1268.

¹⁸ *Franklin's Tale*, p. 740.

¹⁹ Froissart, *L'Espinette Amoureuse* (Scheler, I, 2037). In matters of phrasing, Froissart was the French writer whom Chaucer was most likely to follow. Machaut avoided "penance" in his love-poetry, even when tempted by a long series of rhymes in *-ance*; and Deschamps, for all his fluency in describing his sorrow, seems not to have thought of drinking it.

It might have a rather cheap sense, as when used of the wretched adventurer in the *Tale of Beryn*. The Pardoner intends to secure the barmaid's company for himself; but, says the author, he would have been better off lying in the mire:

For such was his fortune, he drank without the cupp.²⁰

Later, the host of the Canterbury tavern announces that if the Pardoner attempts to realize his plans,

He shall drynk for Kittis love withoute cup or pot.²¹

But in the *Franklin's Tale*, the phrase obviously refers to the pangs of true love, and however jaunty or slangy it may seem, it is used seriously.

Probably, then, Chaucer's line had a double implication: that the Squire's draught of unpleasant experience was taken internally, out of sight of all men; and that it caused him great anguish. Although the line may not be easily paraphrased so as at once to preserve the metaphor and to give its meaning, the sense is, "In secrecy he suffered bitter pain from love."

W. H. FRENCH

Cornell University

FOUR CHAUCER SAINTS

A brief study of the saints by which the pilgrims swore indicates that the choice of oaths was not entirely haphazard. Skeat remarks in his edition of Chaucer that the carpenter who lived at Oxford would naturally swear by St. Frideswide (A 3449) since the priory of St. Frideswide was at Oxford, and that John, in the *Reve's Tale*, being a Northumberland man would swear by a Northumberland saint, St. Cuthbert (A 4127); but in neither case has he found the complete significance of the oath.¹ Saint Frideswide besides being a local saint was noted for her ability to heal the sick.² That she was celebrated in the time of Chaucer for profici-

²⁰ F. J. Furnivall and W. G. Story, *The Tale of Beryn* (London: Early English Text Society, Extra Series, cv, 1909), 306.

²¹ Line 460.

¹ F. N. Robinson in his text adds nothing to Skeat here.

² *Acta Sanctorum*, October 19, VIII, 533.

ency in the art of healing is seen in the fact that her present shrine, which was reconstructed on the plan of that built for her in the latter half of the thirteenth century, has woven among its carvings leaves which have healing properties.

The maples, bryony, celandine, columbine, and water crows-foot, which all have healing properties and are to be found included in the old herbals allude to the nursing of the sick to which St. Frideswide was devoted, for she had learnt the art of healing from her aunt, the Abbess of New Minster.³

The situation in lines A 3442-52 is just such as to call forth an expletive of this sort. The carpenter thinks that Nicholas is ill; he has been studying magic too much. Therefore, he does not simply express his excitement by calling out the name "Frideswide," but he calls directly for aid: "Help us, Frideswilde."

The expletive 'by saint Cutberd' (A 4127) is used just as fittingly by John in the Reeve's tale as 'Frideswide' was by the carpenter. When the two students find that they can no longer go back to the school that night they beg the miller to grant them the hospitality of his house for the night, which the miller gladly does. Though it was natural for John being a Northumberland man to swear by a Northumberland saint, there may be a second reason for the use of this expletive. John in thanking the miller before suggesting that they are hungry, swears by Saint Cuthbert. St. Cuthbert on one occasion entertained angels unaware and was rewarded by having food miraculously supplied him:

þo he cam a-zein with þe hote bred: his gist ne fond he nouȝt;
 þare-of halde þis holie man; gret wonder in is þouȝt.
 þicke snouȝ was þare-oute: he ne miȝte nouȝt finde is fore,
 ȝware-forth he wende a-wei: in snowe ne in þe flore.
 Ase he souȝte þeone holie man: a[n] wende a-boute wed wide,
 he smulde a suyþe swote smul: in a chaumbri þare-bi-side.
 þo he into þe caumbre cam: he fond a bord i-sprad,
 And þreo loves þare-op-on al hote.: þo was he wel glad,
 And seide, þis was godes Aungel: þat hath þis hidere i-brouȝt; ⁴

³ J. Charles Wall, *Shrines of British Saints*, (London, 1905), pp. 67-71. See also, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City Oxford*. The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of England (London, 1939), p. 43.

⁴ *Legendary Lives of Saints* (E. E. T. S. 1887), I, 361; cf. *Venerabilis Bedae, Opera Quae supersunt omnia* edited with English translation by J. A. Giles (London, 1843) IV, 228-233, 244-247.

In swearing by Saint Cuthbert, John suggests to the miller the idea that hospitality is rewarded. When the rewards gained by the miller are remembered, the irony of the use of the expletive here becomes apparent.

Skeat's note concerning St. Yve (B 1417) is glaringly inaccurate. He identifies this saint with the little known St. Ivia or Ivo, a Persian bishop who preached in England in the seventh century. F. N. Robinson in a note on this interpretation thinks that the saint referred to is Yves (or Yve), the patron saint of Brittany but names also a possibility the twelfth-century bishop of Chartres. I believe that Chaucer is more likely to have had in mind the French saint, Saint Ivo of Chartres,⁵ than the Breton saint. The other saints sworn by in this tale, the Shipman's, are 'seint Martyn' (B 1338), 'Seint Denys of Fraunce' (B 1341), 'seint Jame' (B 1545) and 'Marie' (B 1592). Since the scene of the Shipman's Tale is St. Denis of France, the first two oaths indicated are quite in character, for both Saint Martyn and Saint Denis were in turn patron saints of France. Marie was not a local saint. Swearing by Saint James, presumably of Compostella, would also be quite natural, for his was one of the most frequently visited shrines of Chaucer's day; but it would be peculiar for the merchant of the Shipman's Tale to pass by the famous French bishop, St. Ivo, and seek out a Breton saint or a comparatively unknown English saint with which to enforce his word.

Another imprecation the significance of which has been overlooked is found in the prologue to the Merchant's tale. Here the Merchant swears by 'Seint Thomas of Ynde' (E 1230) to enforce the truth of his statement.

That I seye sooth, by Seint Thomas of Ynde (E 1230)

The incredulity of Thomas the Apostle, who was later a missionary to India, is well-known. That this attribute of Thomas was a popular tradition may be seen in legendary art which represents him as either 'placing his hand, with an expression of doubt and fear, on the wounds of the Savior; or, his doubts being removed, he is gazing upwards in adoration and wonder.'⁶

Lawrence College

RUTH HUFF CLINE

⁵ *Acta Sanctorum*, May 20, vol. v, 78-83.

⁶ Anna Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, ed. Estelle M. Hurl (Boston, 1895) I, 242-244.

SOME CHAUCER ALLUSIONS BY SIR EDWARD COKE

Since the publication of Miss Spurgeon's monumental collection of Chaucer allusions,¹ a number of articles have appeared offering supplemental references.² So far as I am aware, no one has verified Miss Spurgeon's single reference to Coke,³ the authenticity of which she herself was unable to confirm.

The purpose of this note is twofold: (A) to supply the source and quotation from Coke to which Miss Spurgeon alluded and to correct her dating of the passage; and (B) to present two additional Chaucer allusions by Coke.

A. Coke's reference to the *Canon's Yeoman's Tale*, of which Miss Spurgeon said she had "not been able to trace the origin," occurs in *The Third Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England: Concerning High Treason, and other Pleas of the Crown, and Criminall Causes*.⁴ The relevant section appears in Chapter Twenty, which is concerned with a statute enacted in 1403 (5 H. 4. ch. 4) and is titled "Of Felony in such as use the Craft of Multiplication." It reads as follows:

C A P. XX.

Of Felony in such as use the craft
of Multiplication.

NONE from henceforth shall use to multiply gold or silver, or use the craft of multiplication: and if any the same doe, he shall incur the pain of felony.

This is the shortest act of Parliament that we remember: before the making whereof, divers of the Nobility, Gentry, and others did wast and consume a great part of their inheritance, and wealth, about the art of

¹ C. F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion*, Cambridge University Press, 1925.

² See J. E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings of Middle English* (New Haven, 1916), and Supplements.

³ Spurgeon, III, 66: "[n. a. 1634] Coke . . . [d. 1634] his good opinion of the Canon's Yeoman's Tale," citing Emerson's statement that "Coke valued Chaucer highly because the Canon Yemen's Tale illustrates the Statute fifth Henry IV, chap. 4 against alchemy."

⁴ London, M. Flesher for Lee and Pakeman, 1644, p. 74; *The First Part of the Institutes* . . . (London, Printed for the Societie of Stationers, 1628), is more popularly known as Coke's Commentary on Littleton.

multiplication, by the subtile and sinister perswasion of certain imposters, and deceivers, which took upon them to be skilfull therein, and to be able to multiply gold and silver, being themselves for the most part very poor and indigent persons, of whom it was said, *Quod pollicentur aliis ingentes divitias, & ipsi petunt parvas drachmas*. See Chaucer our English poet, who wrote about the time of the making of this Act, in the tale of the Channons Yeoman, fo. 63. (*in libro meo*,) that The end of this sliding and cursed craft (so full of imposture and deceit) is extream beggery: He is worth the reading, for he discovereth the secrets of this Craft, as our Act tearms it.

Both the *Second* and *Third Institutes* had been completed by Coke in 1628; but he had deferred their publication since, in his discussions of many controversial constitutional questions, he made the Parliament and the common law the supreme authorities.⁵ Publication, he justifiably suspected, would be tantamount to inviting imprisonment in the Tower. His home and offices were, in fact, ransacked in 1631 by order of the Privy Council; and his manuscripts and papers, even including his will, were still in Charles' possession at the time of Coke's death in 1634.⁶ They were not returned to his son until a resolution of the House of Commons on 12 May 1641 provided that Coke's heirs should "publish in print the commentary . . . according to the intention of the said Sir Edward Coke."⁷

The *Third Part of the Institutes* was accordingly published in 1644. The date then for this entry should be either 1628, by which year the *Institutes* were probably completed, or 1644, the date of publication; the date is not 1634, as chosen by Miss Spurgeon perhaps because that being the year of Coke's death it seemed a reasonable tentative *terminus ad quem*.

B. There is another Chaucer allusion in the *Third Institutes*, in Chapter One, page one, dealing with a statute enacted in 1352 (25 E. 3. ch. 2), called *De proditionibus*. The chapter, "Of High Treason," deals with various kinds of treason, among them the

⁵ W. S. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law* (London, Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1924), v, 471.

⁶ C. Wm. Johnson, *The Life of Sir Edward Coke* (London, Henry Colburn, 1837), II, 320-329.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 458 f. The actual bill in furtherance of the resolution was not brought in till 7 March 1642; the journals of 3 June 1642 state that "The Comment upon Magna Charter" (*The Second Part of the Institutes*) is already printed; cf. *D. N. B.*, XI, 243.

use of counterfeit coins called "Lusheburgh." The marginal note explains:

Lusheburghs, alias *Luzenburghs* were a kinde of base Coine to the likeness of our English money, so called, because they were coined in *Lusheburgh*, which sometime was an Earledome, and after a Dukedome. See *Chaucer* in the Prologue to the Monks Tale, the Host speaking to a lusty Monk, saith, *God wot, no Lusheburghes pay ye*, that is (upon the coherence of the Verse) No payment make ye that is not full and currant.

The Second Part of the Institutes of the Lawes of England^a also contains an allusion to Chaucer, this to the Serjeant at Law. The reference occurs in Coke's comment on the *Statutum de Marlebridge*, enacted in 1267 (52 H. 3 ch. 11). The statute forbids fines in certain cases "for vicious pleading."

[Pro pulchre placitando] In truth it was, as hath been said, as well in respect of the vicious pleading, as of the faire pleading by way of amendment.

This extended to pleadings, and not unto Counts, and pleints, neither doth it extend to the Kings higher Courts of Justice, but to these four here named, for in the higher Courts there were faire and good pleadings; whereof the English Poet (speaking of the Serjant at Law) saith,

Thereto he could indite and make a thing,
There was no wight could pinch at his writing.

The Second Part was published, under the circumstances described above, in 1642.

Although Coke consciously tried to ornament his style by citations from a wide variety of sources, he apparently had little respect for "poetasters," whom he stigmatizes at the end of his discussion of the statute on alchemy:

The fatall end of these five are beggery; This kind of Alchemist, the Monopolist, the Concealer, the Informer, and Poetasters.

Saepe pater dixit, Studium quid inutile tentas?
Maconides nullas ipse reliquit opes.

I could give examples (of mine own observation) of all these, if it were pertinent to our purpose.^b

^a London, M. Flesher, and R. Young, for E. D. R. M. W. L. and D. P., 1642, p. 123.

^b *The Third Part of the Institutes* . . . , p. 75.

His use of Chaucer, then, to explain and substantiate the legal analyses is doubly flattering to the poet. For evidently with Coke, one of the great minds of English legal history, the reputation of Chaucer had not suffered that deterioration which Miss Spurgeon noted¹⁰ was to be his fate in the seventeenth century.

LILLIAN HERLANDS HORNSTEIN

New York University

CHAUCER AND PARTONOPE OF BLOIS

Professor R. M. Smith, in *MLN*, 51 (1936), 320-322, has pointed out some striking parallels between Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* and a Middle-English version of the Old French romance *Partenopeus de Blois*. He has not listed all the parallels. Compare, for instance, the following:

Chaucer

Ne in Belmarye ther nys so fel leon,
That hunted is, or for his hunger
wood,
Ne of his praye desireth so the
blood,
As Palamon to sleen his foo Arcite.
(*KnT*, 2630-33)
And kyng Emetreus, for al his
strengthe,
Is born out of his sadel a swerdes
lengthe,
So hitte him Palamoun er he were
take; (*KnT*, 2645-47)

At many a noble armee hadde he be.
At mortal battailles hadde he been
fiftene,
And foughten for oure feith at
Tramyssene
In lystes thries, an ay slayn his foo.
(*Prol.*, 60-33)

There are doubtless others.

Partonope of Blois

As a lyon þat wode was he ferde,
That hongry was and lakked his
pray,
So ferde he when þat he sey
He myght not rescowe gentill
Gaudyns, (10577-80)¹
And hym hitte with so grete an Ire,

Oute of his sadile he made hym lepe.
(9930-31)
And fro þe stede þat he be-strode
Oute of þe sadill he hym caste.
(10853-54)
and hym so hitte
That in his sadill he myght not sitte.
(10972-73)
In many a mortall bataille haþe
he be.
In listes often eke fought haþe he,
And ever of his Enemeyce þe better
haþ hadde. (11858-60)

¹⁰ Spurgeon, I, Pref. x.

¹ Ed. A. T. Bodtke, *EETS*, *ES*, cix (1912).

But it does not follow—as Professor Smith would have it—that Chaucer's lines were derived from *Partenope of Blois*. Although this OF romance may be dated as early as the twelfth century, no manuscript of the ME version has been dated earlier than the mid-fifteenth century;² and although Professor Smith points to Chaucer's references to "Parthonope" in *Anelida* (line 58) and in *Troilus* (v. 1503), the Parthonope to whom Chaucer refers and Partonope of Blois are unquestionably two entirely different men. Chaucer's Parthonope is one of the seven heroes who died at the famous siege of Thebes; by no means should he be confused with Partonope of Blois. Until the English version of *Partonope of Blois* can be dated prior to the fifteenth century, or the Chaucerian lines in this version shown to have counterparts in some OF version,³ lack of evidence to the contrary should force us to attribute these parallels to Chaucerian influence on the fifteenth-century English translator.

JOHNSTONE PARR

University of Alabama

CRESSEID'S LEPROSY AGAIN

In *MLN*, LIX, 265-69, Professor Marshall W. Stearns points out that in Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid* the poet's choice of Saturn and the Moon as the planets to bestow leprosy upon Cresseid is astrologically appropriate inasmuch as leprosy is one of the diseases under the jurisdiction of Saturn. But nowhere does Professor Stearns explain Henryson's choice of Luna as Saturn's co-worker in bestowing upon Cresseid the dreadful disease. What has Luna to do with the matter? Perhaps the answer may be found in the text of an early sixteenth-century astrologer, Joannes ab Indagine, whose twenty-third "Canon" reads:

Saturne with the Moone engendreth the fallen sicknesse, blacke chollere, leprosy and fistula, . . . morphew, goute, and oftentimes sodaine panges.¹

² Cf. Bodtker's "Prefatory Note."

³ I do not find any of these Chaucerian lines in the Tours MS. 939 (MLA Rotograph 95) or in the *Bibliothèque Arsenal MS.*, ed. G. A. Crapelet (Paris, 1834), two volumes.

¹ *Briefe introductiones . . . unto the art of Chiromancie, . . . Physi-*

Francisco Junctinus, author of one of the most comprehensive texts on astrology in the Renaissance, who analyzes and reports his mediaeval predecessors with scholarly acumen, also writes under a chapter headed "De Elephantia [Leprosy]":

Luna in Tauro, & Saturnus in Scorpione in eius oppositione, vel Saturnus in Tauro & Luna in Scorpione, si nulla beneficia protexerit, elephantiae vitium decernunt.²

Joannes Baptista Porta, another Renaissance writer who reports faithfully the mediaeval astrologers, records the following (from Julius Firmicus Maternus's *Astronomicon sive Matheseos*) under a chapter entitled "Morbi Lunares":

Iulius Firmicus, corpus macularum varietate signare dixit, lepra, ut malignis ulceribus, in corpus ipsum assidua contorsione deformet.³

And Claudius Ptolemy's authoritative *Quadripartitum* substantiates the notion that Luna is definitely connected in some way with the leprous affliction:

For the most part injuries come about when the moon is near the solstitial or equinoctial signs, particularly at the spring equinox, injuries by white leprosy; at the summer solstice, by lichens; at the fall equinox, by leprosy; . . .⁴

Henryson's choice of Lune as Saturn's partner in bestowing leprosy upon Cresseid is therefore unquestionably appropriate.

In his attempt "to examine the poet's background for and presentation of the leprosy of Cresseid,"⁵ Professor Stearns presents the probability of Henryson's first-hand observance of lepers at Dunfermline; but he neglects to consider what Henryson might have learned from the texts of the eminent mediaeval physicians. Henryson depicts Cresseid's leprosy as a "seiknes Incurabil" which "for evermair" deprives her of her "greit fairnes, . . .

ognomy, . . . *Astrology*, trans. Fabian Withers (London, 1575), Bk. II, sig. Kiiii verso.

² *Speculum Astrologiae* (Lugduni, 1581), I, 290. This statement appears (almost verbatim) also in Joannis Joviani Pontani's *De Rebus Coelestibus*, Liber IX, in *Opera* (Venice, 1519), III, 262 verso.

³ *Physiognomoniae Coelestis Libri Sex* (Rothomagi, 1650), p. 61. Maternus's *Matheseos* is, with Ptolemy's *Quadripartitum*, one of the two most authoritative astrological texts of classical antiquity.

⁴ Bk. III, ch. 12. I cite from F. E. Robbins's translation, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, 1940), p. 327.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 265.

bewtie gay, . . . wanton blude, and . . . goldin Hair" (lines 313-315); and he associates the cause of the disease with "Melancholy" (line 307).⁶ He makes Luna bestow upon Cresseid the following sentence (lines 337-341):

'Thy Cristall Ene minglit with blude I mak;
Thy voice sa cleir, unplesand, hoir, and hace;
Thy lustie lyre ouirsprede with spottis blak,
And lumpis haw appeirand in thy face;
Quhair thow cummis, ilk men sall fle the place';

Henryson remarks Cresseid's "uglye Lipper face" (line 372), and also the

. . . bylis blak ouirsprede in hir visage,
And hir fair colour fadit and alterait. (lines 359-396)

And Cresseid finally wails (lines 443-449):

'My cleir voice and courtlie carolling,
Quhair I was wont with Ladyis for to sing,
Is rawk as Ruik, full hiddeous, hoir, and hace;
My plesand port, all utheris precelling—
Of lustines I was hald maist conding—
Now is deformit the Figour of my face
To luik on it na Leid now lyking hes':

Now a remarkably similar description of leprosy or elephantiasis may be found in almost every medical work of any importance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—works which include ancient classical authorities, the Arabian authorities, and the eminent English physicians.⁷ All of these medical men are agreed that (at least after a certain stage) the disease is incurable, and that it is precipitated by either the melancholic humour or its equivalent, the black bile.⁸ Collectively they are agreed that the disease deprives

⁶ All references to lines from the *Testament of Cresseid* are from *The Poems of Robert Henryson*, ed. G. Gregory Smith (Edinburgh and London, 1908), vol. III.

⁷ Cf. Chaucer's list of authoritative physicians cited by the Doctor of Physic (*C. T.*, A429-434). Of the doctors I cite anon, Rhases, Galen, Serapion, Avicenna, Gaddesden, Bernard Gordon, and Gilbertus Anglicus are on Chaucer's list.

⁸ Paulus Aegineta, Galen, Nonnus, Psellus, Avenzoar, Leo, and Bartholomaeus Anglicus associate elephantiasis or leprosy specifically with melancholy; Actuarius, Avicenna, Haly Abbas, and Rhases associate it with black bile (from which, of course, melancholy arises). See *The Seven*

one of hair, turns the color of the skin to a blackish hue, covers the body (particularly the face) with ulcerations, tubercles, or spots, alters the eyes, changes the voice, and deforms the body. For example, among the ancient classical physicians who discuss the symptoms of elephantiasis, Celsus says "The upper part of the body is covered with frequent spots and tumours, . . ." ⁹ Aretaeus writes: "The face in particular is affected with callous tubercles or warts, . . ." ¹⁰ Aetius says "the cheeks and chin become thickened and of a livid colour, . . . eminences are formed all over the body, but especially on the forehead and chin." ¹¹ Actuarius records "tumours on the face, an alteration of the appearance of the eyes, a change of the voice, . . . and cutaneous eruptions of an intractable nature." ¹² Even Pliny describes elephantiasis "as affecting the face in particular with hard, rough, black maculae." ¹³

Among the Arabian physicians, whose translators call the disease *lepra*, Avicenna records the symptoms as "redness of the face, inclining to lividity; falling off of the hairs, . . . affection of the breathing, thickening and discoloration of the lips; . . . loss of voice." ¹⁴ Serapion writes that the face "is swelled, livid, and covered with hard pustules, the hairs of the eyebrows fall off, the whole aspect becomes hideous, the voice is changed, . . . and ulceration seizes different parts of the body." ¹⁵ And Rhases says: "The colour of the eye is changed, the voice becomes rough, the face is swelled . . . and red with nodes, the hairs fall off, and the extremities at last become swelled and ulcerated." ¹⁶

Among the English physicians the descriptions are likewise detailed and appalling. Bernardus de Gordon says: ". . . on the face there is a kind of pallor verging upon the deathly, and the appearance of the face is terrible with its fixed look. . . . The color of the face is reddish inclining to blackness, the breathing begins to alter, and the voice becomes hoarse." ¹⁷ John of Gad-

Books of Paulus Aegineta, trans. Francis Adams (London, 1846), II, 1-23. In his commentary on each chapter of Aegineta, Adams presents detailed statements paraphrased from all the other important mediaeval physicians.

⁹ Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁷ *Practica dicta Lilium medicinae* (Lyons, 1491), cap. xxii. Cited by W. C. Curry, *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York, 1926), p. 42.

desden writes: "... the color of the body tends toward black; the patient is afflicted with labored breathing and a husky voice, ... thinness and falling of the hair, ... and a greasiness of the skin."¹⁸ Gilbertus Anglicus adds: "The eyes are watery and bloodshot."¹⁹ All of the physical details of Cresseid's leprosy, one perceives, may be found in the works of the eminent mediaeval physicians.

It may be observed that the afflicted Cresseid's diet of "mowlit Breid" instead of her customary "waillit Wyne and Meitis" (lines 440-441) is also substantiated by the medical authorities. In his regimen for elephantiasis Paulus Aegineta writes: "The food should be barley bread. . . . But let him abstain from wine during the whole continuance of the complaint."²⁰ And Dr. Andrew Boorde maintains: "He that is infectyd wyth any of the foure kyndes of lepered must refrayne from al maner of wyne, and from new drynkes, and strong ale; . . . and from eating of fresshe beef, . . . and in no wyse eate no veneson, nor hare-fleshe, and such lyke."²¹

In view of this array of mediaeval medical authority it is apparent that Henryson did not necessarily derive his description of Cresseid the leper from first-hand observation of lepers at Dunfermline. In fact, the mediaeval conception of this dreadful disease would doubtless have made one in his right mind hasten to the medical tomes rather than venture close enough to the lepers to perceive the afflicted one's bloodshot eyes, lumpis haw, bylis blak, and raucous voice.²²

JOHNSTONE PARR

University of Alabama

¹⁸ *Rosa Anglica practica medicinae* (Pavia, 1492), car. 56, rl. Cited by Curry, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

¹⁹ *Compendium medicina* (Lugduni, 1510), fol. ccxl, vl. Cited by Curry, *op. cit.*, p. 44. Cf. also Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, trans. Stephen Batman (London, 1582), p. 64: "In those afflicted with leprosy the flesh is perceptibly corrupted, the eyes . . . have a certain glitter; . . . and the voice becomes raucous."

²⁰ Adams, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

²¹ *A Dyetary of Helth, EETS, ES, x*, 293-294.

²² The author wishes to express his thanks to the University of Alabama Research Committee for the purchase of microfilm used in the preparation of this paper.

*LOTE, LOTE3 IN SIR GAWAIN AND THE
GREEN KNIGHT*

The meaning of *lote* in a particular passage of *Sir Gawain* is not always easy to determine, and in 639 particularly. Its etymon, ON. *lát*, like the Engl. sb. *let*, is rarely used in the sg. except in compds.: *út-lát*, 'outlet,' *blód-lát*, 'blood-letting'; though its ME. deriv. forms *lot* and the present *lote* appear not infrequently. The sg. meanings of the ON. word, 'loss, death, decease,' do not seem to appear in Engl. texts,¹ only the pl. meanings, 'manners,' especially 'bad manners,' hence 'howling, uproar,' being found. We are somewhat in the dark about the cause of this disappearance of the ON. sg. meanings and transfer of pl. to sg. forms in ME.: *NED.* (*late*, sb.¹) merely records it as a fact; *EDD.* does not list the word in sg. or pl. as current or obsolete in Mod. E., and though E. Björkman (*Scand. Loan-Words in ME.*, pp. 90-91) lists it, he does not explain the appearance of the pl. meanings of *lát* in the ME. forms *lot*, *lote* derived from it.²

The word occurs with the meaning, 'manner(s), looks, demeanor, appearance,' in *St. Katherine* (EETS. No. 80, 105), *Ancren Riwe* (Cam. Soc. 1853, Vol. 57), *Genesis and Exodus* (EETS. No. 7, 1162, 2328), and these meanings, with one exception in 4384, are to be found also in the allit. *Wars of Alex.* But in our poet while *lote* has the meaning 'manner(s), good manners,' and hence 'bearing, demeanor, appearance,' or even 'gesture' (see *Pearl* 238 where 'demeanor' is as likely to be correct as 'speech,' 896 where 'bearing' seems indicated by the context which describes the Lamb's dumbness before his shearers), it retains also the more specialized pl. senses of ON. *lát*, 'boisterous manners, loud noise, din,' then more specifically, 'laughter, noisy conversation,' and is

¹ I speak under correction. Others may yet be more fortunate in finding instances of their occurrence.

² It is not difficult to see one way in which pl. forms in ON. or early ME. could become confused or identified with the sg. The ON. prepositional phrases *af látum*, *með látum* would become *of loten*, *with loten*, and when the final *n* was lost, no one could have told whether the resulting form was pl. or sg. dative. Thus a speaker in ME. times would regard the phrases *of lote*, *with lote* as expressions in the sg., though in reality they are direct continuations of the ON. prepositional phrases cited above.

once even used to denote the noise that accompanies the whetting of steel on a grindstone.

Mrs. Wright (*JEGP.* 38.8) would translate two of three occurrences of the word in *Pearl* and eight of eleven occurrences in this poem as 'word, speech,' but fails, I think, to remember that one's 'words' or 'speeches' are often to be included in the impression which his 'manners' or 'demeanor' make upon us. In *Pearl*, as I have shown above, *lote* may just as appropriately be translated 'bearing, demeanor' as 'word, speech,' the meanings she tries to establish, and her assertion that 'no instance occurs in *Sir Gaw.* of *lote* meaning "gesture," or "appearance"' is too positive.

In 638-9

As tulk of tale most trwe,
& gentylest knyzt of lote

it is admittedly difficult to ascertain whether *lote* refers solely to G.'s 'bearing' or 'carriage,' or to the sounds he utters, his 'speech' (an essential part of his 'manner(s)'). While 638 may imply the latter, the evidence plainly shows that the word includes both senses, and the author, an artist in verbal nuances, probably used it with full awareness of all its connotations.

I list below the approximate meanings of *lote*, *lote3*, wherever either one of the two forms occurs in the works of the *Gawain*-poet.

Gawain

bearing; audible utterance, speech, 639, 1116 (?).

noisy sound, din, 119, 1623, 1917, 2211.

uproar, babble (of conversation), 244.

jests (provoking laughter), 988, 1086, 1116 (?), 1399, 1954.

Pearl

bearing, demeanor, speech, 238, 896.

loud sound, din (of thunder), 876.

The instance of *lote* in 1205 which Gollancz translates 'vision' and lists as der. from ON. *lát*, Osgood refers—more correctly I think—to OE. *hlōt*, 'lot, fortune.'

Patience

loud noise (of the winds), 161.*

HENRY SAVAGE

*The Library,
Princeton University*

* I gladly express my thanks to Professor Stefán Einarsson of Johns Hopkins University for advice and counsel in the preparation of this note. He is not responsible for any errors that may be found in it.

A NOTE ON ÆLFRIC'S TRANSLATION OF JOB I, 6

Ælfric in his *Catholic Homilies* translates Job, I, 6,¹ as follows:

Hit gelamp on sumum dæge, Ðaða Godes englas comon, and on his gesihþe stodon, Ða was eac swylce se sceuca him betwux.

A comparison of this translation with the received Vulgate shows that *englas* has been used for *fili*. This departure Ælfric has explained by prefixing to this verse a unique Latin note: 'Una translatio dicit "filii Dei," et altera dicit "angeli Dei."' ² The note is evidently intended for the eyes of whatever priest might come to deliver the homily. Since Ælfric translated "angeli" when "filii" was the reading of the "standard" recension, he undoubtedly felt obliged to justify the presence of "englas" in his translation.

What, then, is the "altera translatio?" The only such translation that I have been able to discover is a translation of Job by Jerome from Origen's Greek *Hexapla*.³ I give therefrom Job, I, 6:

Factum est, in his diebus: et ecce venerunt angeli, ut astarent coram Domino. Et venit equidem diabolus cum eis.⁴

Two other versions of Job, I, 6, may have been available to Ælfric:

Quadem autem die, cum venissent Angeli Dei, ut assisterent coram Domino, adfuit inter eos etiam Satanas.⁵

Et ecce venerunt Angeli Dei, ut starent coram Deo.⁶

Neither of these two versions can be called an "altera translatio." The first is indeed a complete translation with interlinear comment. Its only significant variation from the Vulgate, how-

¹ Homily no. 35 of vol. II in B. Thorpe, *The Homilies of Ælfric*, London, 1843, p. 446.

² *Loc. cit.*

³ S. Eusebius Hieronymus, "Liber Job (altera versio)," in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Patrum Latinorum*, XXIX, cols. 61-115.

⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 63A-B.

⁵ S. Eusebius Hieronymus, *Expositio Interlinearis Libri Job*, in Migne, *ed. cit.*, XXIII, col. 1409C.

⁶ S. Aurelius Augustinus, *Annotationum in Job*, in Migne, *ed. cit.*, XXXIV, col. 825.

ever, is the substitution of *angeli* for *fili* in verse 6. The second version of verse 6 is in no sense part of a translation.

We must therefore conclude that when Ælfric wrote "altera translatio," he was referring to Jerome's rendering of Origen's Job. Thus in his homily he translated the "standard" recension—that is, the Vulgate as he knew it—except for the word *fili*, and for this he wrote *englas*, justifying the substitution by the *angeli* in Jerome's translation of Origen.

CHARLES REXFORD DAVIS

Rutgers University

NOT IN THE DICTIONARIES

None of the following words, as used here, is listed in *The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia* (1913), the *New English Dictionary* (1888-1933), *Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary* (1934), *Webster's New International Dictionary* (1943), or the *Dictionary of American English* (1938-1944):

ALL-OF-A-SUDDEN, adj. "The children were fond of him because he was so all-of-a-sudden." James Stephens, *The Crock of Gold* (London, 1912), p. 82.

BANK-HOLIDAY, v. "Now, it is not decent for a factory girl from Limehouse to go bank-holidaying under any but a hat of plush . . ." Arthur Morrison, *Tales of Mean Streets* (London, 1894), p. 35.

CANDELABRA, v. ". . . we passed stone farmhouses with pear trees candelabraed against their south walls . . ." Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (New York, 1929), p. 47.

CROCK-KNEED, adj. "' . . . You old thief, you! you lob-eared, crock-kneed fat-eye!'" James Stephens, *The Crock of Gold*, p. 36. See context.

DEATH-TERROR, n. "He was cool with the mania of death-terror." Liam O'Flaherty, *The Informer* (London, 1925), p. 268.

MARKWELL, n. ". . . I did therefore once intend, for the Ease of the Learner, to set down in all Parts of the following Dialogues certain Marks, Asterisks, or *Nota-bene's* (in *English*, *Markwell's*) after most Questions, and every Reply or Answer; directing exactly the Moment when One, Two, or All the Company are to laugh . . ." Simon Wagstaff [Jonathan Swift], *A Complete Collection of Genteel and Ingenious Conversation* . . . (London, 1738), p. xi.

PETERPANTHEISM, n. Title of section and of essay in Holbrook Jackson, *Romance and Reality* (London, 1911), pp. 39, 41. Jackson says (p. 43): "*Peter Pan* . . . is a mystery play, giving significance to the child-like spirit of the universe."

PSEUDALIST, n. "... this [law] on education . . . would have completed the great object of qualifying them to select the veritable aristoi, for the trusts of government, to the exclusion of the pseudalists . . ." Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, October 28, 1813, in A. A. Lipscomb, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, 1905), XIII, 400-401.

ROBOTESS, n. "*Sulla: A Robotess . . . Helena: A Robotess*" Karel Capek, *R. U. R.*, tr. Paul Selver (New York, 1923), p. v. "The Robotess Helena." *Ibid.*, p. 184.

The *NED*, *Funk and Wagnalls*, and *Webster's*, which list *robot*, refer to *R. U. R.*

SPLEENICAL, adj. "You see there is nothing spleenical in all this." John Keats to George and Georgiana Keats, October, 1818, in Sidney Colvin, ed., *Letters of John Keats to His Family and Friends* (London and New York, 1891), p. 181.

SUN-FORSAKEN, adj. "A child is born to them, but soon dies in this sun-forsaken valley." Havelock Ellis, *The New Spirit* (London, 1890), pp. 150-151.

WINEFULLY, adv. "I had drunk much wine and afterward coffee and Strega and I explained, winefully, how we did not do the things we wanted to do; we never did such things." Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms*, p. 13.

JOSEPH PRESCOTT

University of Connecticut

MILTON QUOTES FROM PETRARCH?

In an anti-papal passage in *Of True Religion* Milton asserts that "one of their own famous Writers found just cause to stile the Romish Church *Mother of Error, School of Heresie*."¹ The famous writer seems to be Petrarch, who calls the Pope's court

Albergo di dolor, madre d'errori,²

and in Sonnet 107

Fontano di dolore, albergo d'ira,
Scola d'errori e templo d'eresia.

Presumably Milton is quoting from memory. More than thirty years earlier he translated five lines of Sonnet 107 for *Of Reformation*.³

ALLAN H. GILBERT

Duke University

¹ Columbia ed., VI, 167.

² Sonnet 91.

³ Columbia ed., III, 27; see also II, 43.

A MISPRINT IN *THE AWKWARD AGE*

In the crucial thirtieth chapter of Henry James's *Awkward Age* (p. 324 of the London edition, p. 426 of the New York edition), there appears to be a slight misprint similar to those Mr. Chapman has pointed out in several of Trollope's novels. Aggie in an adjoining room is sitting on a book in order that Lord Petherton may not take it from her. "But what in the world," Mrs. Brookenham asks, "is the book selected for such a position? I hope it's not a very big one." "Big" is the reading of all the copies I have seen, yet the context calls for "bad." The size of the volume does not matter but its badness matters greatly, for Nanda's reading it and her not being disturbed by "anything so revolting"—her mother's phrase—is what seals her fate with Vanderbank. Furthermore, Mrs. Brookenham's remark is immediately answered by Mr. Cashmore's query: "Oh, aren't the books that are sat upon as a matter of course the bad ones?" To which Harold Brookenham replies: "They sit, all around, nowadays . . . on some awfully good stuff"; and a moment later Tishy explains: "It's just because the thing's bad that Lord Petherton is trying to wrest it."

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

A NEW METEOROLOGICAL THEORY OF STRESS

The following quotation, from Oscar Cargill's "The Laggard Art of Criticism,"¹ certainly deserves a place among the florilegium of Professor Leonard Bloomfield's "secondary responses":²

When atmospheric conditions altered the speech of Europeans settled in America, so that immigrants of all nationalities said "*con-tents*" when the dictionary then insisted on "*con-tents*," it was obvious that iambic verse, the great measure of the French and the English, did not provide a natural melodic line for the poets of this country. . . . Free verse, the emancipating invention [!] of Walt Whitman, was the inevitable product of the long revolt against the heroic couplet; but it is significant that the poet's most successful experiments all throw the accent forward, as the natural, incisive speech of his countrymen demanded.

¹ *College English*, vi (1945), 245.

² "Secondary and Tertiary Responses to Language," *Language*, xx (1944), 45-55.

Professor Cargill's "secondary response" should be particularly gratifying to all students of language in the light of his vigorous attack upon linguistic study in *Intellectual America* (New York, 1941), p. 521, where he states that even the classical scholars, under the baleful leadership of Gildersleeve of Hopkins, "turned away from the teaching of concepts to the venal study of syntax and word origins" when "the wolfish pursuit of moronic vocabularies and the ghoulish unearthing of the kennings and pennings of the Northern barbarians diverted young students from the true historical fount of wisdom—the Greek and Roman classics."

Mysterious "atmospheric conditions" (mysterious to the linguist, at any rate) have been used by the amateur philologist to explain many linguistic phenomena (vigorous articulation of the Germanic languages due to cold climate, vigorous articulation of Arabic due to hot climate, English spoken with a minimum of lip-movement due to cold, damp, foggy climate, ad infinitum), but this is the first time I have ever seen the common Germanic tendency towards initial stress³ attributed to the vagaries of the American climate,⁴ and I believe the attribution is worthy of record.

THOMAS PYLES

University of Oklahoma

³ Considerably reinforced as far as *contents* is concerned by Jespersen's principles of value (meaning of first syllable sufficiently important to attract accent), rhythm, and the fact that contrasting stress distinguishes *contént* (adj.) and *cóntent* (n.). Cf. *compáct* (adj.) and *cómpact* (n.).

⁴ Dictionaries of British English usage record the initial stress for *content*(s), particularly when the word refers to non-material things, as "the contents of a book." Wyld's *Universal Dictionary* records only initial stress when the singular form means "essential elements; real meaning" (the *cóntent* of a proposition, statement, etc.). The influence of the American climate, if Professor Cargill's explanation be accepted, has been indeed far-reaching. Perhaps an indignant "leader" in the *Times* is called for.

REVIEWS

Tobias Smollett, Traveler-Novelist. By GEORGE M. KAHRL. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Pp. xxiv + 165. \$2.75.

Mr. Kahrl's study is based on the naturalistic view of Smollett's works, as represented by Thackeray's well-known pronouncement on Smollett's art, with which Mr. Kahrl begins and ends his book: "He did not invent much, as I fancy, but had the keenest perceptive faculty, and described what he saw with wonderful relish and delightful broad humour." Accepting the full implications of this view, Mr. Kahrl sets the theme of his book by continuing: "No one has perceived that Thackeray's criticism can be applied more aptly to a traveler than to a novelist." Smollett's works, Mr. Kahrl says, may be compared with such travel-books as those of Captain Dampier, for Dampier, "like Smollett, was a sturdy adventurer who invented little but described what he saw with . . . accuracy and relish."

This judgment may be fairly applied to Smollett's *Travels through France and Italy*; but can one validly say that Smollett wrote "much of his best prose fiction" with "the spirit and purpose of a traveler"? The spirit of a traveler such as Dampier lies in his zealous observation of facts; his purpose is to see and to report accurately. *Humphry Clinker*, in part, meets this definition, especially in the Scottish scenes. But, as Mr. Kahrl says later, "The excellence of *Humphry Clinker* lies . . . in the diversity in reactions of a group of travelers." That is, in the fictive ingredient, which, especially in the English sections of the book, results in outrageously laughable satire. In the novel as a whole, the literal descriptions of Scotland play a counterpoint to the caricature of English society—which arises primarily from that caricature of a traveler, Matthew Bramble. Smollett's art of fiction is caricature; one compares his fiction with travel-literature only to feel that the novels exist in a different realm. Mr. Kahrl is aware of this difficulty in his position, for in regard to *Roderick Random* he notes that "Smollett turned his travels into fiction with so much sharpness of satiric intent that he was moved to omit all the factual earmarks of a travel book"; and he concludes that "Smollett obviously realized that the novelist may learn from the voyager, or historian, or scientist but that ultimately he must universalize his interpretation." This is a sound point of view, but it is not that expressed in Thackeray's statement, and it is not applicable to a travel-book. Mr. Kahrl never resolves this contradiction; one may

do so by understanding that for the most part Smollett does not really write in the mode of the travel-book, but that he sometimes adopts the guise of a traveler as a vehicle for satire and comedy. It is also legitimate to point out, as Mr. Kahrl does, that travel is an important ingredient in picaresque fiction, and that it thus plays an important part in Smollett's novels.

If one keeps these qualifications in mind, Mr. Kahrl's concentration on Smollett as traveler will be seen to emphasize a number of significant points. In an illuminating survey of Smollett's life in London, Mr. Kahrl shows how Smollett's Scottish origin isolated him from English society, made him essentially an alien, with something of a foreign traveler's detachment in observing the English. And, uprooted from his homeland, he could also view Scotland with relative objectivity. In this general and almost metaphorical sense it may fairly be said that Smollett "permanently retained the point of view of a traveler."

In his search for historical and biographical material, Mr. Kahrl has produced some new and interesting facts. Through careful examination of manuscript records he adds to our knowledge of Smollett's activities during the Carthagena expedition. Similar careful research has turned up new material about the originals of Trunnion, Hatchway, and Pipes. The most extended piece of historical research deals with Captain Robert Stobo, traditionally regarded as the original of Lismahago. It is good to have all the facts about Stobo thus assembled, although it appears that most of Lismahago's adventures and most of his characteristics have other origins, as Mr. Kahrl concedes. One very amusing and significant discovery is not related to travel: Smollett's use of an eighteenth-century edition of a Latin cook-book attributed to Apicius, in composing the "Entertainment in the Manner of the Ancients" in *Peregrine Pickle*. This is a superb example of Smollett's ability to work up a hilarious scene from the most unpromising materials; his culling of details from "Apicius" is remarkably similar to his culling of learned details from various secondary sources in his *Travels*. Again one is impressed, not with the learning, but with the selectivity, energy, and humor of the result. In view of this similarity, it is difficult to see why Mr. Kahrl repeats the traditional praises of Smollett's classical "learning" in the *Travels*.

All in all, Mr. Kahrl has written a useful and informative book, although his conclusions in general and in detail must sometimes be considerably modified. With his own discoveries he has combined much material from previous articles and books on Smollett, thus bringing together scattered information in such a way as to make his study a very convenient handbook for future students of Smollett and the eighteenth century.

LOUIS L. MARTZ

Yale University

The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. Edited by JOHN BUTT. Vol. v. *The Dunciad*, edited by JAMES SUTHERLAND. London: Mathuen, 1943. Pp. lvi + 476.

Alexander Pope: A List of Critical Studies Published from 1895 to 1944. By JAMES EDWARD TOBIN. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., 1945. Pp. 30.

Mr. Sutherland's edition of *The Dunciad* continues the high standard already set by the editors of the earlier volumes of the set. *The Dunciad* presents peculiar and almost insuperable difficulties in the way of a complete critical edition. The complicated history of the work and the innumerable variants of both text and commentary must be reduced to some orderly plan which the reader will find practicable. Mr. Sutherland has decided to present the text in two states, the first based on the 1728-29 versions, and the second on *The New Dunciad* of 1742 and its variations with a complete reprinting of the earlier books. In order to save space he has omitted from the later version some of the prose commentary, giving merely references to the first. He has also frankly used his judgment as to whether all the variant readings of the commentary should be recorded and has omitted what he considered unimportant changes. Such exercise of editorial discretion will limit the usefulness of the volume for certain scholarly purposes, but most readers can only be grateful to the editor for keeping the size of the book within compass. The specialist who needs to compare the minuter variations of the commentary will have to consult a set of the original editions.

The annotation of this volume is so thorough and includes so much new matter that it far surpasses any previous edition of *The Dunciad*. Particularly valuable are the abundant illustrations and *pièces justificatives* from contemporary books, pamphlets, and journals. A cursory comparison of almost any page with the Elwin-Courthope edition reveals the greater richness and pertinence of the illustrative passages and the far more thorough and rigorous standards of the modern editor.

The careful student will encounter some obscurities in the annotation, perhaps because the editor had to be grudging of space. "Ricardus Aristarchus of the Hero of the Poem" is printed on pages 254-265, but without any note that it is by Warburton, although his authorship is duly noted on page xxxvii of the "Introduction"; one might have expected on page 254 a note on Warburton's authorship with a reference to Pope's letter of December 28, 1742, which establishes the fact. The note on the letter of Dr. Tripe (page 45) is not full enough to be entirely satisfactory, as may be seen by comparing it with Professor Hooker's note in his edition of Dennis (II, 459). A reference by Pope to Cibber's

Letter (p. 260) is interestingly illustrated by a quotation from Voltaire, but the reader would have been better served by the sentence from Cibber. On page 61 a note quotes "an earlier version" than the printed one, without any explanation. It is, of course, one of the marginal readings copied into a volume of *The Dunciad* by Jonathan Richardson the Younger. These readings were copied out by Elwin and are printed, presumably accurately and completely, in the Elwin-Courthope edition. Mr. Sutherland quotes them from the Elwin-Courthope edition when he thinks they are important, and refers to them somewhat inappropriately as from the "EC manuscript." He nowhere notes that the volume containing these marginalia is preserved in the Huntington Library (see Griffith's *Bibliography*, p. 149).

But it is easier to discover shortcomings in the printed volume than to prepare the copy for such an extremely complicated work. No one can work long over this volume without admiration for its sound scholarship and for the dexterity and lucidity achieved in presenting so intricate a subject.

Professor Tobin's list of critical studies of Pope since 1895 is a very useful compilation; it is inclusive, and its topical arrangement facilitates its use by students. It covers a period during which there has been something like a revolution in the study and criticism of Pope.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

BRIEF MENTION

Juridical Folklore in England. By JOHN W. SPARGO. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1944. Pp. viii + 163. \$2.50. This book is not a treatise on juridical folklore in general, but on this type of folklore as "illustrated by the cucking-stool." The author's professional equipment as linguist, folklorist, and legal historian made him the man to trace the history of "sousing scolding women in the water" by judicial process, with the cucking-stool or some other piece of machinery as tool. The traces led him to many places, and brought much curious matter to light. In particular, the punishment seems at first to have been given, not to scolds but to bakers and others. In the author's words, "probably the punishment of publicly ducking in a pair of balances an offender against the customary statutes of weights and measures is the earliest ascertainable origin of the cucking-stool. Extension . . . to persons who offend by their tongues . . . is due to the scriptural warning that the tongue is a fire" (p. 148). I note that OE *þeaw* is consistently misspelt *þeaw*.

K. M.